+ + + + + +

### ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + + +

### PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + + +

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF FLORIDA ROCK •

Case No. 95-16P

PROPERTIES, INC.

Hearing Room 220 South 441 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

Tuesday September 23, 1997

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to notice, at 7:06 p.m. **BEFORE:** 

MAYBELLE TAYLOR BENNETT Chairperson

HERBERT M. FRANKLIN Commissioner

JOHN G. PARSONS Commissioner

| Preliminary Matters                      | 232 |
|--|-----|
| Presentation by Davis Buckley            | 250 |
| Presentation by Albert Dobbins           | 261 |
| Presentation by Mark Nixon               | 268 |
| Presentation by Mark Davis               | 271 |
| Questions by the Commission              | 280 |
| Cross examination by ANC representatives | 322 |
| Adjournment                              | 374 |

| 1  | P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S                                |
|----|--|
| 2  | (7:06 P.M.)  |
| 3  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Good evening                    |
| 4  | ladies and gentlemen. My name is Maybelle Taylor     |
| 5  | Bennett. I am chairperson of the District of         |
| 6  | Columbia Zoning Commission. Joining me this evening  |
| 7  | are Commissioners Franklin and Parsons. I declare    |
| 8  | this public hearing open.                            |
| 9  | The case that is the subject of this                 |
| 10 | hearing is case number 95-16P, an application from   |
| 11 | Florida Rock Properties, Incorporated, requesting    |
| 12 | preliminary first stage approval of a planned unit   |
| 13 | development and related changes to zoning from M to  |
| 14 | C-3C for lots 800, 801, and 802 in square 707; lot   |
| 15 | 809 in square 708; lot 807 and 808 in square 708E;   |
| 16 | and lot 806 in square 708S.                          |
| 17 | This continued hearing will be conducted             |
| 18 | in accordance with the provisions of DCMR 3022. The  |
| 19 | order of procedure will be as follows: first,        |
| 20 | preliminary matters; second, completion of the       |
| 21 | applicant's case; third, the report of the Office of |
| 22 | Planning; fourth, the report of other agencies;      |
| 23 | fifth, the report of the Advisory Neighborhood       |
| 24 | Commissions, 6B and 2D, parties in support, persons  |
| 25 | in support, parties in opposition, persons in        |

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 (202) 234-4433

opposition.

26

| 1  | The Commission will adhere to this                   |
|----|--|
| 2  | schedule as strictly as possible. Those presenting   |
| 3  | testimony should be brief and nonrepetitive. If you  |
| 4  | have prepared a statement, please give copies to     |
| 5  | staff and only summarize the highlights. Each        |
| 6  | individual appearing before the Commission must      |
| 7  | complete two identification slips and give them to   |
| 8  | the reporter before making a statement. If these     |
| 9  | guidelines are followed, an adequate record can be   |
| 10 | developed in a reasonable length of time.            |
| 11 | The decision of the Commission in this               |
| 12 | contested case must be based exclusively on the      |
| 13 | public record. To avoid any appearance to the        |
| 14 | contrary, the Commission requests that parties,      |
| 15 | counsel, and witnesses not engage the members of the |
| 16 | Commission in conversation during any recess or at   |
| 17 | the conclusion of the hearing session. While the     |
| 18 | intended conversation may be entirely unrelated to   |
| 19 | the case that is before the Commission, other        |
| 20 | persons may not recognize that the discussion is not |
| 21 | about the case.                                      |
| 22 | The staff will be available to discuss               |
| 23 | procedural questions.                                |
| 24 | All individuals who wish to testify and              |
| 25 | who were not previously sworn, please rise to take   |
| 26 | the oath.  |

| 1  | Ms. Van Dorn do you plan to testify                  |
|----|--|
| 2  | Is there anyone else who planned to                  |
| 3  | testify if you have not previously been sworn.       |
| 4  | If you have previously been sworn it is              |
| 5  | still all right is it not Ms. Dobbins?               |
| 6  | MS. DOBBINS: Yes, it is. You are still               |
| 7  | under oath and you are sworn in this case.           |
| 8  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: All right, because              |
| 9  | this is a continuation. Anyone else?                 |
| 10 | MS. DOBBINS: Please raise your right                 |
| 11 | hand.  |
| 12 | (The witnesses were sworn.)                          |
| 13 | MS. DOBBINS: Thank you, please be                    |
| 14 | seated.  |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Okay. Thank you.                |
| 16 | Let's begin with preliminary matters. I              |
| 17 | do know of one and that is Ms. Ambrose had requested |
| 18 | to be able to testify at the beginning of the        |
| 19 | hearing.   |
| 20 | Are there any other preliminary matters              |
| 21 | before I call her to the stand?                      |
| 22 | MS. DOBBINS: Madame Chair, the only                  |
| 23 | other preliminary matter that I have would be that a |
| 24 | request from The Committee of 100 that the record    |
| 25 | remain open for at least a week to receive their     |
| 26 | written testimony in this case. You have a copy of   |

| 1  | that.   |
|----|---|
| 2  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Okay.                          |
| 3  | And there is an additional expert                   |
| 4  | planning consultant I understand.                   |
| 5  | MS. DOBBINS: There is a request.                    |
| 6  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: All right. We                  |
| 7  | will get that we have to consider whether or not    |
| 8  | this expert is expert enough to appear before us as |
| 9  | an expert.  |
| 10 | MR. PARSONS: That shouldn't take over               |
| 11 | an hour right?                                      |
| 12 | (Laughter.)   |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: If there are no                |
| 14 | further preliminary matters, why don't we ask Ms.   |
| 15 | Ambrose to come forward.                            |
| 16 | Good evening.                                       |
| 17 | MS. AMBROSE: Good evening Ms. Bennett.              |
| 18 | I am City Councilmember Sharon Ambrose,             |
| 19 | representing Ward 6 on the Council of the District  |
| 20 | of Columbia.  |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Excuse me, could               |
| 22 | you please press the green button there.            |
| 23 | MS. AMBROSE: And I thank you ladies and             |
| 24 | gentlemen for your indulgence in allowing me to     |
| 25 | speak early tonight to accommodate my schedule.     |
| 26 | I am pleased to present testimony in                |

| 1                                | support of the project at issue in PUD case number   |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 2                                | 95-16P. The case before you is a unique private  |
| 3                                | sector initiative for much needed economic   |
| 4                                | development in Ward 6. The location of the proposed  |
| 5                                | development on what is one of the few privately  |
| 6                                | owned waterfront properties along the Anacostia  |
| 7                                | river makes this project one which all of us need to   |
| 8                                | give careful consideration.  |
| 9                                | The District of Columbia has been very   |
| 10                               | tardy in recognizing the potential of its  |
| 11                               | riverfronts for appropriate and needed residential   |
| 12                               | and commercial development, as well as for   |
| 13                               | recreational and educational uses.   |
| 14                               | The Office of Planning recommendations   |
| 15                               | for the Buzzard Point-Capitol Gateway Overlay  |
|                                  |  |
| 16                               | District provide a thoughtful and proactive blue   |
| 16<br>17                         | District provide a thoughtful and proactive blue print for the kind of development that can begin to   |
|                                  |  |
| 17                               | print for the kind of development that can begin to  |
| 17<br>18                         | print for the kind of development that can begin to take advantage of the special urban resource of our  |
| 17<br>18<br>19                   | print for the kind of development that can begin to take advantage of the special urban resource of our waterfront. The Office of Planning recommendations   |
| 17<br>18<br>19<br>20             | print for the kind of development that can begin to take advantage of the special urban resource of our waterfront. The Office of Planning recommendations in the case before you tonight represent a balanced   |
| 17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21       | print for the kind of development that can begin to take advantage of the special urban resource of our waterfront. The Office of Planning recommendations in the case before you tonight represent a balanced consideration of the proposed PUD within the context  |
| 17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21       | print for the kind of development that can begin to take advantage of the special urban resource of our waterfront. The Office of Planning recommendations in the case before you tonight represent a balanced consideration of the proposed PUD within the context of that overlay district recommendation.   |
| 17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22 | print for the kind of development that can begin to take advantage of the special urban resource of our waterfront. The Office of Planning recommendations in the case before you tonight represent a balanced consideration of the proposed PUD within the context of that overlay district recommendation.  The location of the proposed PUD is an |

| 1  | important element of riveriront to not only a higher |
|----|--|
| 2  | and better use, but a use that will dramatically     |
| 3  | increase public access to an improved waterfront.    |
| 4  | The exciting development at the Washington Navy Yard |
| 5  | provides an economic catalyst that could be          |
| 6  | definitively leveraged by the kind of development    |
| 7  | proposed for this PUD.                               |
| 8  | There are, however, concerns with the                |
| 9  | Florida Rock proposal. Advisory Neighborhood         |
| 10 | Commission 6B articulated some of theses concerns in |
| 11 | its March vote against the proposal when it first    |
| 12 | came before you. Some of ANC 6B's concerns were      |
| 13 | similar to the issues raised by the Office of        |
| 14 | Planning at that same hearing.                       |
| 15 | I have carefully reviewed the response               |
| 16 | of the applicant to those issues and find that many  |
| 17 | of them have been addressed in the adjusted proposal |
| 18 | which you have before you this evening. The          |
| 19 | critical considerations of the project's mass, urban |
| 20 | design elements, and provision of access to the      |
| 21 | waterfront have been thoughtfully addressed in the   |
| 22 | new design. And a greatly improved access and more   |
| 23 | open river vista it allows.                          |
| 24 | In responding to those concerns,                     |
| 25 | however, the applicants have determined that the     |
| 26 | site will not accommodate the previously hotel       |

| 1  | component which would have met by a stretch of       |
|----|--|
| 2  | definition the overlay requirement for residential   |
| 3  | element. I find this a distressing complication. I   |
| 4  | believe that we need residential development along   |
| 5  | the waterfront and that it is marketable in the      |
| 6  | District as developments along the Potomac river     |
| 7  | have proved.   |
| 8  | As a 30 year resident of Ward 6 I also               |
| 9  | know that the area in which this PUD is located is   |
| 10 | not an area where privately financed market rate     |
| 11 | housing is currently a viable prospect. The          |
| 12 | question becomes do we refuse to allow any           |
| 13 | development along the Anacostia in Ward 6 that does  |
| 14 | not include residential or do we deal with each      |
| 15 | parcel within the desired mixed use context of the   |
| 16 | overlay zone and the extant economic reality as each |
| 17 | individual parcel can contribute to the long range   |
| 18 | goal?  |
| 19 | I believe that the Office of Planning                |
| 20 | accurately expressed this dilemma in its March 26    |
| 21 | comments on the PUD when it stated: "The primary     |
| 22 | issues and choices are fairly clear, whether to      |
| 23 | approve a large all commercial PUD suitable for a    |
| 24 | major federal tenant with no assurance that the      |
| 25 | residential component would ever be built, but with  |
| 26 | a chance that a major commercial development would   |

| 1  | ultimately be a catalyst for mixed use development.  |
|----|--|
| 2  | Or to require" the emphasis is the Office of         |
| 3  | Planning's "a residential component effectively      |
| 4  | precluding the proposed PUD and leaving the          |
| 5  | development future of the area rather bleak for the  |
| 6  | foreseeable future.                                  |
| 7  | I am here this evening to say that I                 |
| 8  | support the approach of approving the PUD and        |
| 9  | working with the applicant, the community which I    |
| 10 | represent, and the ECC project which will implement  |
| 11 | some of the amenity provisions of the PUD to make    |
| 12 | this proposal a contributing element of the          |
| 13 | transforming of our Anacostia waterfront and the     |
| 14 | surrounding Near Southeast community. A              |
| 15 | transformation and opportunity firmly launched by    |
| 16 | the Navy Yard Project.                               |
| 17 | I also understand that we cannot afford              |
| 18 | a Field of Dreams approach to this critical          |
| 19 | development opportunity. This is indeed a            |
| 20 | speculative venture in many respects. The applicant  |
| 21 | has made firm assurances to the ECC project for      |
| 22 | continued support regardless of what transpires in   |
| 23 | respect to the larger project and the applicant will |
| 24 | speak to those assurances this evening. That is      |
| 25 | very important to the community I represent.         |
| 26 | In the assistance the applicant has                  |

| 1  | assured the ECC the community will gain a            |
|----|--|
| 2  | wonderfully exciting, educational, and work training |
| 3  | resource at a time and place where it is desperately |
| 4  | needed. The applicant has also promised to work      |
| 5  | with the current and future tenants of the Florida   |
| 6  | Rock properties to encourage the employment of       |
| 7  | qualified neighborhood residents in existing jobs.   |
| 8  | But the real benefits of this project                |
| 9  | and the potential for the realization of the goals   |
| 10 | for the overlay area are dependent in large part on  |
| 11 | persuading the U.S. Department of Transportation to  |
| 12 | locate in the building proposed for the site. I      |
| 13 | intend to work with the economic development         |
| 14 | agencies of the District, with my colleagues on the  |
| 15 | City Council, and with local private sector business |
| 16 | leaders and property owners to urge Congress and the |
| 17 | appropriate agencies of the federal government to    |
| 18 | approve the locating of the U.S. Department of       |
| 19 | Transportation at the Florida Rock site. As          |
| 20 | Congress and the President strive to assist the      |
| 21 | District to become a world class city we who are     |
| 22 | local elected officials and residents need to direct |
| 23 | their attention to ways in which they can be         |
| 24 | immediately helpful. Planting the DOT on the         |
| 25 | Florida Rock site could be a major boost for         |
| 26 | economic revitalization in Ward 6.                   |

| 1  | We need to put some muscle into                      |
|----|--|
| 2  | achieving the economic development goals of this     |
| 3  | city. In Ward 6 we want to enhance the quality of    |
| 4  | life for all of our residents by expanding housing   |
| 5  | and business opportunities throughout the ward. I    |
| 6  | believe that approval of this PUD moves int that     |
| 7  | direction.   |
| 8  | I ask, however, that you give serious                |
| 9  | consideration to limiting the time frame of this     |
| 10 | approval and any extensions of the approval. There   |
| 11 | have been too many instances of PUD projects that    |
| 12 | have been approved and have had those approvals      |
| 13 | extended over long periods of time effectively       |
| 14 | precluding any other potentially more viable         |
| 15 | proposals for the same location from coming forward. |
| 16 | Thank you for your consideration of my               |
| 17 | testimony this evening.                              |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Thank you Ms.                   |
| 19 | Ambrose, thank you for coming down.                  |
| 20 | Let me ask you this question. So even                |
| 21 | if this PUD were not able to build a residential     |
| 22 | component, a hotel component you would still be in   |
| 23 | favor of it, is that what you are saying?            |
| 24 | MS. AMBROSE: Yes I would, Ms. Bennett.               |
| 25 | And I have to say that I feel very strongly that the |
| 26 | recommendations for mixed use that are presented in  |

| 1  | the Office of Planning overlay district for Buzzard  |
|----|--|
| 2  | Point-Capitol Gateway are very, very important. But  |
| 3  | the reality is that right now in that part of Ward 6 |
| 4  | residential in not going to happen. I believe that   |
| 5  | if we and it really goes against my planning         |
| 6  | instincts to say that we should adjust our vision of |
| 7  | the comprehensive plan and the land use elements of  |
| 8  | that plan, project by project. But we have such an   |
| 9  | opportunity here with the Navy Yard development to   |
| 10 | really use that as launch for economic               |
| 11 | revitalization that I believe could also help us to  |
| 12 | bring residential to that area, that I just feel     |
| 13 | strongly that I should support this project. And I   |
| 14 | will encourage people in my community and property   |
| 15 | owners who own property down there to look a little  |
| 16 | bit harder at this area.                             |
| 17 | I think also that the NCPC Monumental                |
| 18 | Core proposal reinforces the desire for viable       |
| 19 | commercial development int his part of town. I am    |
| 20 | happy about the residential component but I really   |
| 21 | would not like to see us refuse this PUD because it  |
| 22 | doesn't contain the residential right now. I just    |
| 23 | don't think it is going to fly right now.            |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Thank you very                  |
| 25 | much. Colleagues, questions for Ms.                  |
| 26 | Ambrose.   |

| 1  | Mr. Parsons.   |
|----|--|
| 2  | MR. PARSONS: Yes. Thank you for coming               |
| 3  | and sharing your views. I have two questions. The    |
| 4  | first is your suggestion that we limit the time of   |
| 5  | this PUD. It has been our practice to do that for a  |
| 6  | two year period are you familiar with that?          |
| 7  | MS. AMBROSE: Yes I am.                               |
| 8  | MR. PARSONS: Is that what you are                    |
| 9  | suggesting?  |
| 10 | MS. AMBROSE: No I am not. I am                       |
| 11 | suggesting that I don't know what the appropriate    |
| 12 | time limitation should be. I do know, however, that  |
| 13 | there are PUD all over town, including Ward 6 that   |
| 14 | have been hanging out there for 10, 12 years in some |
| 15 | cases. And it is a genuine discouragement to other   |
| 16 | people. So I think what I am suggesting is that      |
| 17 | whether two years is the right amount of time or not |
| 18 | I am not sure. I am sure however that continued      |
| 19 | extensions has been a proven disincentive to         |
| 20 | development in some areas of the city.               |
| 21 | MR. PARSONS: You have hit upon our                   |
| 22 | dilemma as well. The idea and the planning goal is   |
| 23 | to have a lively waterfront with mixed use and so    |
| 24 | forth. And along comes the Department of             |
| 25 | Transportation request. And I wondered if you were   |
| 26 | implying not to put in your mouth that if the        |

| 1  | DOT decision did not land on this site, we should    |
|----|--|
| 2  | cancel the PUD. In other words the thrust of your    |
| 3  | testimony is to take advantage of that situation.    |
| 4  | MS. AMBROSE: Let me just make clear to               |
| 5  | take advantage not only of the possibility that DOT  |
| 6  | could be a tenant, but also to take advantage of     |
| 7  | this symbiotic situation, if you will, that is       |
| 8  | created by what we know is going to happen at the    |
| 9  | Navy Yard.   |
| 10 | MR. PARSONS: So your recommendation is               |
| 11 | not dependent on the DOT, in other words if we       |
| 12 | approved an all office component here and DOT went   |
| 13 | elsewhere, you would still have us leave this PUD    |
| 14 | open so they could shop for other tenants.           |
| 15 | MS. AMBROSE: Yes. I am saying that                   |
| 16 | because if it is possible to bring a viable          |
| 17 | commercial enterprise to this area at this time then |
| 18 | I think we should do it because I think that allows  |
| 19 | us to leverage what's happening at the Navy Yard.    |
| 20 | So that we possibly begin to get some of the mixed   |
| 21 | use for that entire area both on the other side of   |
| 22 | the street, on the intervening there are two         |
| 23 | parcels intervening between the larger parcel and    |
| 24 | the 664 lot where ECC would be. I think any kind of  |
| 25 | commercial development that is viable, large enough  |
| 26 | to create a critical mass of enterprise down there   |

| 1  | that would help spur development and leverage the    |
|----|--|
| 2  | Navy Yard development is desirable.                  |
| 3  | MR. PARSONS: One thing that we have                  |
| 4  | learned in the business of zoning is that the next   |
| 5  | applicant  |
| 6  | MS. AMBROSE: I know.                                 |
| 7  | MR. PARSONS: comes to us with this                   |
| 8  | decision and says what's good enough for him is good |
| 9  | enough for him is good enough for me.                |
| 10 | MS. AMBROSE: I know.                                 |
| 11 | MR. PARSONS: How                                     |
| 12 | MS. AMBROSE: I don't know, you know.                 |
| 13 | That is the real conundrum here. And I think that    |
| 14 | for the foreseeable future in this particular area   |
| 15 | that we might just have to deal with it parcel by    |
| 16 | parcel. Because this is a very fragile opportunity,  |
| 17 | I believe, very fragile. And I want to tell you      |
| 18 | that it is going to take some real hustle on my part |
| 19 | and that of the responsible city agencies to make    |
| 20 | some things happen down there. And I will say quite  |
| 21 | candidly that it is going to take some cooperation I |
| 22 | believe from the public housing receiver as well to  |
| 23 | do the kinds of renovation at the Arthur Capper      |
| 24 | project and at Potomac Gardens and some of the other |
| 25 | projects that very immediately impact on this area   |
| 26 | to work with us in making some necessary changes.    |

| 1  | I think this is a gestalt here but this              |
|----|--|
| 2  | part of what can make it happen.                     |
| 3  | MR. PARSONS: Thank you.                              |
| 4  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Franklin?                   |
| 5  | MR. FRANKLIN: No questions Ms. Ambrose               |
| 6  | but I greatly appreciate your testimony. You are     |
| 7  | singing my song because my colleagues know not       |
| 8  | granting extensions of PUDs very readily. We have    |
| 9  | adopted new regulations which allow us to scrutinize |
| 10 | them up closely and I plan to do that when they come |
| 11 | up before us because I agree with you that we have   |
| 12 | been to lax in extending those previous approvals    |
| 13 | without a really convincing showing that diligent    |
| 14 | good faith effort has been put into getting          |
| 15 | financing. And I happen to agree with you that we    |
| 16 | are dealing with an area of the city where parcel by |
| 17 | parcel PUDs if it comes to that will be necessary    |
| 18 | for the foreseeable future because we really have a  |
| 19 | great difficulty in turning this area around. So     |
| 20 | thank you for sharing your insights with us.         |
| 21 | MS. AMBROSE: Thank you.                              |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Hold on for a                   |
| 23 | minute is there any cross examination by counsel?    |
| 24 | MS. GIARDANO: No.                                    |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Or by is there                  |
| 26 | a representative from the ANC 2D?                    |

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 (202) 234-4433

| 1  | (No response.)                                      |
|----|---|
| 2  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: ANC 6B?                        |
| 3  | (No response.0                                      |
| 4  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: I suppose you will             |
| 5  | not want to cross examine Ms. Ambrose, but I offer  |
| 6  | you that opportunity.                               |
| 7  | All right thank you for coming down, we             |
| 8  | thank you for your testimony.                       |
| 9  | We now move onto the completion of the              |
| 10 | applicant's case. And the first order of business   |
| 11 | is why don't we entertain the request for having    |
| 12 | an additional expert planning consultant.           |
| 13 | MS. GIARDANO: Yes thank you good                    |
| 14 | evening members of the Commission. We would like    |
| 15 | Mr. Dobbins testify as to the consistency of the of |
| 16 | the comprehensive plan. I believe we are one day    |
| 17 | short of the traditional 14 day notice who the      |
| 18 | witnesses are and what they are going to testify on |
| 19 | if look at this in terms of a pre-hearing           |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Did you request a              |
| 21 | waiver?   |
| 22 | MS. GIARDANO: I am requesting a waiver              |
| 23 | of one day. That is what I am getting to. So we are |
| 24 | requesting a waiver of one. I just want to also     |
| 25 | note that the topic that he is going to be          |
| 26 | testifying on was clearly delineated in our pre-    |

| 1  | hearing submission. So the material is not new it    |
|----|--|
| 2  | is justa new face.                                   |
| 3  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Okay, thank you.                |
| 4  | I have no problem with that. Any other parties have  |
| 5  | problem with that?                                   |
| 6  | (No response.)                                       |
| 7  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Hearing none.                   |
| 8  | MS. GIARDANO: Thank you very much.                   |
| 9  | As you know we have submitted some urban             |
| 10 | design materials, a package prepared by Davis        |
| 11 | Buckley's firm. And what we would like to do is ask  |
| 12 | Mr. Buckley to not go through all those studies but  |
| 13 | just hit some of the highlights of the conclusions   |
| 14 | of the studies that were requested by the Commission |
| 15 | that lead up to a new design approach that we are    |
| 16 | proposing this evening, which is the lowering of the |
| 17 | height of the building and opening up of the gateway |
| 18 | aspect. So I would ask if we could start with Mr.    |
| 19 | Buckley's presentation of that. And then we will go  |
| 20 | to Mr. Dobbins testimony and then Bob Nixon and Mark |
| 21 | Davis from the Earth Conservation Corp have also     |
| 22 | provided some additional detail as to their proposal |
| 23 | for the maritime institute on square 664 east. And   |
| 24 | we would like to update the Commission on their      |
| 25 | efforts in that regard.                              |
| 26 | We have a short video tape and a short               |

| 1  | statement from them.                                 |
|----|--|
| 2  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Let me do                       |
| 3  | something before Mr. Butler comes up. In the         |
| 4  | submission that I received, I got eight copies of    |
| 5  | one view and nine copies another when there is       |
| 6  | supposed to be there are certainly not supposed      |
| 7  | to be eight or nine copies of the same thing. For    |
| 8  | instance under study I got nine copies of 9BD2,      |
| 9  | eight copies of 9BD3A, eight copies of 9CD2, four    |
| 10 | copies of 9C3DA, and I am not certain whether I just |
| 11 | had a defective booklet or what but there is a       |
| 12 | problem.   |
| 13 | MR. STRIEGEL: Could you go through that              |
| 14 | one more time.                                       |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: We'll fix that.                 |
| 16 | All right, and next normally when we                 |
| 17 | recognize witnesses as experts we usually receive    |
| 18 | their curriculum vitae into the record, do you have  |
| 19 | that?  |
| 20 | MS. GIARDANO: Would you like to that at              |
| 21 | this time?   |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Let's do that so                |
| 23 | we don't have to do that when he comes up.           |
| 24 | MS. GIARDANO: Mr. Dobbins is                         |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: In a way it is a                |
| 26 | pro forma thing because we know Mr. Dobbins has      |

| 1  | served this city well as its director of planning.   |
|----|--|
| 2  | But we need that in the record.                      |
| 3  | MR. BUCKLEY: Madame chair my name is                 |
| 4  | Davis Buckley and I am architect and planner and     |
| 5  | what I would like to suggest is that if it agreeable |
| 6  | to the Commission we may just proceed on this basis. |
| 7  | We did 13 studies as a result of                     |
| 8  | comments made by the Commission at the last hearing. |
| 9  | And of those 13 studies there are several that we    |
| 10 | felt represented                                     |
| 11 | (Whereupon, the proceedings went off the             |
| 12 | record briefly to adjust the PA system.)             |
| 13 | MR. BUCKLEY: We did 13 studies and we                |
| 14 | modified the design based on the conclusion of many  |
| 15 | of those studies. What I would like to suggest is    |
| 16 | that there are certain studies that we think are     |
| 17 | important to the overall design that substantially   |
| 18 | modified and the like. And what I wold like to is    |
| 19 | maybe identify which studies those are. And as an    |
| 20 | aid in terms of kind of a score card if you will, I  |
| 21 | have made some Xerox copies of the table of contents |
| 22 | that we just might hand out if that is all right.    |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: The table of                    |
| 24 | contents that we have in here?                       |
| 25 | MR. BUCKLEY: Yes. I am just assuming                 |
| 26 | that if you don't have it might be good to have it   |

| 1  | as a reference point.                                |
|----|--|
| 2  | What I would like to do is speak to                  |
| 3  | study number 4, which is the vistas with the         |
| 4  | building on the left side, east side of the          |
| 5  | courtyard set back farther to the east, study number |
| 6  | 5 which is the vistas on the east side, it is sited  |
| 7  | on the Anacostia waterfront, study number 6 and      |
| 8  | study number 8.                                      |
| 9  | Study number 4 came about as a result of             |
| 10 | a question by Commissioner Kress in which she        |
| 11 | suggested that by cutting back the east side of the  |
| 12 | building, that as you enter into the courtyard, you  |
| 13 | may in fact be able to get a more immediate view on  |
| 14 | to the river. And what we did on this study was we   |
| 15 | did series of wire frames that show that if you do   |
| 16 | that the vista onto the waterfront dramatically      |
| 17 | opens up. So if you were to take a look at those     |
| 18 | studies, which would be the second page, you will    |
| 19 | see the existing condition and then the next page    |
| 20 | shows how the building curves around, upstream if    |
| 21 | you will and opens up that vista.                    |
| 22 | And then the study beyond that is                    |
| 23 | basically the revised scheme superimposed over the   |
| 24 | previous scheme. So you can see how that has opened  |
| 25 | up.  |
| 26 | Study number 5 deals with the vistas                 |

| 1  | along the east side of the Anacostia waterfront.     |
|----|--|
| 2  | And I believe that this is a question put to us by   |
| 3  | Commissioner Franklin. What I would like to show is  |
| 4  | just a point of reference if I may. Al, could you    |
| 5  | help me with this?                                   |
| 6  | In order for us to kind of visualize                 |
| 7  | where this vista is, what we have done is flattened  |
| 8  | out the waterfront, essentially from the Navy Yard   |
| 9  | over to a portion of Buzzard Point. And what you     |
| 10 | will see is if Tom could move his hand over to the   |
| 11 | plan view of the development site proper, you can    |
| 12 | see the height of our proposed development in        |
| 13 | relationship to the proposed build out up to M       |
| 14 | Street. And Tom you might just want to point down    |
| 15 | where that is with the Capitol Street beyond. Now    |
| 16 | this study represents as does the study in the book, |
| 17 | all of the documentation we were able to get from    |
| 18 | both the Navy Yard's most recent master plan which   |
| 19 | will be released in October. They were kind enough   |
| 20 | to give us quite a bit of information about what     |
| 21 | their proposed plans are.                            |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Buckley, hold               |
| 23 | on just a minute, I noticed some of our citizens     |
| 24 | kind of squirreled around here and take a peek. If   |
| 25 | you all could either stand at an angle where others  |
| 26 | can while we can see and they don't have to scoot up |

| 1          | underneath.  |
|------------|--|
| 2          | MR. BUCKLEY: I appreciate that because               |
| 3          | I was trying to read it backwards.                   |
| 4          | What this represents is basically                    |
| 5          | flattening out the entire water front from Buzzard   |
| 6          | Point to the left and then coming across to South    |
| 7          | Capitol Street, Capital Gateway, Southeast Federal   |
| 8          | Center and the Navy Yard. And this is actually       |
| 9          | suggested by Al Dobbins as a kind of reference point |
| .0         | to help articulate the height, bulk, and mass along  |
| .1         | the waterfront if we were to lay this in two         |
| _2         | dimensional plan. The studies themselves if we can   |
| _3         | look at those for a minute.                          |
| _4         | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: We are at number                |
| <b>.</b> 5 | 5.   |
| <u> </u>   | MR. BUCKLEY: We are at number 5.                     |
| L7         | I might add this is not an easy study.               |
| _8         | There are little arrows within the                   |
| .9         | Anacostia river as we move up the river toward the   |
| 20         | site and then starting with study 5 through 8 there  |
| 21         | are views down the river. And there are some         |
| 22         | interesting, very interesting design issues here.    |
| 23         | For instance under study we had two studies here.    |
| 24         | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Well you have them              |
| 25         | let me ask you this. For each of your arrows you     |
| 26         | have view of B2 and a view of B3A. Is that right?    |

| 1  | MR. BUCKLEY: We have two views B2 and                |
|----|--|
| 2  | B3A. And the difference between those two is that    |
| 3  | B2 is the building that was shown previously,        |
| 4  | height, bulk, and mass. And B3A is the revised       |
| 5  | proposal which was suggested by Commissioner Kress   |
| 6  | to simply lower the height of the building. And we   |
| 7  | will talk a little bit about that.                   |
| 8  | The buildings around it also represent               |
| 9  | the potential build out for the east side based upon |
| 10 | the proposed overlay, zoning overlay by the Office   |
| 11 | of Planning. So as you go up the river you take a    |
| 12 | look at the studies, for instance on 2V2, it shows   |
| 13 | the importance and prominence of South Capitol       |
| 14 | Street. That's what the view is there.               |
| 15 | That building that has the large shelf               |
| 16 | will be the build out on the Stewart site. Then our  |
| 17 | building beyond that, the B2 study, the previous     |
| 18 | proposal and B3A, which is what we now have. So      |
| 19 | that this represents the height, bulk, and mass if   |
| 20 | you will, as you approach the building from the      |
| 21 | Anacostia going upstream towards the bridge and its  |
| 22 | relationship to the height, bulk, and mass of those  |
| 23 | buildings and it could be built out on adjacent      |
| 24 | sites.   |
| 25 | And then looking at study 5, B2 and B3               |
| 26 | you are approaching the bridge at that point.        |

| 1  | And then the rest of the studies up                  |
|----|--|
| 2  | through 8 represent views looking downstream toward  |
| 3  | the bridge from an area approximately opposite the   |
| 4  | Navy Yard.   |
| 5  | Study number 6 was requested by                      |
| 6  | Commissioner Parsons if I recall. That was to take   |
| 7  | a photograph of the existing Half Street access      |
| 8  | looking in on the site approximately slightly        |
| 9  | above Potomac Avenue looking across the site to see  |
| 10 | what kind of views you would be able have from that  |
| 11 | vista. And I think that what this shows is that      |
| 12 | while you do have a view of a bridge, there is the   |
| 13 | possibility of having a view of the river water as   |
| 14 | well, which I quite the study was able to            |
| 15 | address.   |
| 16 | As you move further up Half Street,                  |
| 17 | however, that view of the disappears although you do |
| 18 | have a vista of the bridge and certainly light in    |
| 19 | here.  |
| 20 | Study number 8 is an interesting study.              |
| 21 | I think that this study in combination with the      |
| 22 | study which we were asked to do by Commissioner      |
| 23 | Kress are the two most interesting studies. This     |
| 24 | study was suggested to us by Commissioner Parsons.   |
| 25 | Which was if you look beyond and you had a clear     |
| 26 | vista through the site, what would you see, and if   |

| 1  | you were to open that up. So I think that if you     |
|----|--|
| 2  | were to take a look at the first page, what we did   |
| 3  | is we did an extension, straight on extension down   |
| 4  | the axis, say the right side of Half Street if we    |
| 5  | were to go directly through the site.                |
| 6  | Then the next study shows basically the              |
| 7  | previous proposal which was a kind of celebratory    |
| 8  | gateway into the site. And then if we were to move   |
| 9  | that portion of the building back, move it back to   |
| 10 | the north, what you would see. And then if we were   |
| 11 | to move it slightly forward, here is the next series |
| 12 | of studies. And then if we were to just open it to   |
| 13 | the sky and have no gateway and to look straight     |
| 14 | through the courtyard. One shows the building and    |
| 15 | the other one shows the view of the building set     |
| 16 | back.  |
| 17 | The last study has the building slightly             |
| 18 | forward to give it a little sense of termination and |
| 19 | helps your view move around if you will to the left. |
| 20 | I do not want to diminish the importance of that     |
| 21 | view for the future. I do not know what the status   |
| 22 | of that bridge is and I think that Commissioner      |
| 23 | Parson had addressed that, what if the bridge were   |
| 24 | to be replaced and moved further down. I think that  |
| 25 | is a valid point, but I think more importantly the   |
| 26 | issue is that if you were take and move the building |

| 1  | back, would you in fact have an interesting view?    |
|----|--|
| 2  | Notwithstanding that you do have the bridge there,   |
| 3  | that doesn't mean that having the bridge diminishes  |
| 4  | the interests of that view. And in many ways it      |
| 5  | starts to create some interest to as well because    |
| 6  | the activity can occur over it or how that bridge    |
| 7  | can be articulated in the future. It's interesting   |
| 8  | to note many of the bridges of other cities are      |
| 9  | actually festooned with lights and they become a     |
| 10 | really delightful kind of embellishment going across |
| 11 | the river. So we don't necessarily discount the      |
| 12 | importance of that.                                  |
| 13 | So when we start to take a look at what              |
| 14 | I consider significant issues in terms of the urban  |
| 15 | design there are a couple of interesting points.     |
| 16 | Commissioner Kress suggested that we look at         |
| 17 | lowering the height of the building by eliminating   |
| 18 | the hotel. We did this. And what I would like to     |
| 19 | do is take the two massing models and bring them up  |
| 20 | as we did previously. This one which you have seen   |
| 21 | previously. And then the massing model which we now  |
| 22 | have. The quantitative differences between these     |
| 23 | two is that in response to Commissioner Parsons      |
| 24 | suggestion, we have moved the tower element further  |
| 25 | back to the north. And what that does is open up     |
| 26 | the vista to the water. What is also interesting     |

| 1  | about that is that alignment is direct access,      |
|----|---|
| 2  | access on Half Street. So that when you actually    |
| 3  | place in the model and you look down Half Street,   |
| 4  | you actually get a wonderful vista down through to  |
| 5  | the waters edge. Now you do have a portion of the   |
| 6  | bridge at that point but I think that in many ways  |
| 7  | that enhances the views and gives some interest to  |
| 8  | it.   |
| 9  | Now what we did do we also lowered by               |
| 10 | two stories the primary portion of the building. We |
| 11 | now have two separate buildings as you can see, so  |
| 12 | that the height of that building is now 109 feet    |
| 13 | versus what we previously which is 130 feet. The    |
| 14 | building immediately adjacent to the bridge rise to |
| 15 | a height of 109 feet. However, there is a portion   |
| 16 | of the building that goes up to 130 feet, but that  |
| 17 | is fact stepped back from Potomac Avenue, and is    |
| 18 | also immediately adjacent to the bridge. And we     |
| 19 | feel from an urban design viewpoint if you were to  |
| 20 | have the height perhaps that's where it should      |
| 21 | occur.  |
| 22 | There are some other interesting                    |
| 23 | statistics here. One is that we have moved the site |
| 24 | coverage from approximately 63 percent down to 58   |
| 25 | percent while at the same time we have lowered the  |
| 26 | height of the building to 109. But important to     |

| 1  | that is the set back from Potomac Avenue toward the  |
|----|--|
| 2  | top, less stories.                                   |
| 3  | We also looked at further articulation               |
| 4  | to the building from a very simplistic way to give   |
| 5  | it some variety and delight along the waterway. And  |
| 6  | I have to credit to Arthur Moore Coppler for         |
| 7  | suggesting that because he feels that I have a       |
| 8  | shallow terraces coming down toward the water that   |
| 9  | you can really do some very interesting things to    |
| 10 | them in announcing the building. So I took his lead  |
| 11 | and I thought it was a very good suggestion.         |
| 12 | So I think if you were to take these two             |
| 13 | massing models if you will, as you know these do not |
| 14 | articulate architecture or show windows or doors or  |
| 15 | the like but basically set up the massing of the     |
| 16 | development itself.                                  |
| 17 | The revised actually it is not a                     |
| 18 | revised, it is a modification on the previous scheme |
| 19 | as a result of suggestions made by this Commission.  |
| 20 | And while I would like to take credit for those      |
| 21 | recommendations, I really can't but I think what it  |
| 22 | has done is that it has really helped us craft a     |
| 23 | building which I think is in many ways very, very    |
| 24 | elegant. Certainly we have to work on the            |
| 25 | architecture. But I think the height, bulk, and      |
| 26 | mass and the vista and the like, starts to work very |

| 1  | well.  |
|----|--|
| 2  | So I think we have made some progress              |
| 3  | here and I would certainly welcome any further     |
| 4  | comments. I tried to abbreviate this presentation  |
| 5  | Madame Chairman without going through all of the   |
| 6  | studies because the other studies are self-        |
| 7  | explanatory but I think these are the most         |
| 8  | significant in terms of how they modified and      |
| 9  | changed and helped us crack the planned unit       |
| 10 | development.                                       |
| 11 | Do you have any comments?                          |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Colleagues would              |
| 13 | you like to question the architect at this time or |
| 14 | would you like to go through all of the other      |
| 15 | witnesses first?                                   |
| 16 | You want to wait for the other                     |
| 17 | witnesses.   |
| 18 | MR. BUCKLEY: Madame Chairman, one final            |
| 19 | point if I may, the revised scheme meets the       |
| 20 | targeted square footage of 1,530,000 square feet   |
| 21 | which we had been advised and know to the space    |
| 22 | requirements of the potential client. The revised  |
| 23 | scheme does meet that need.                        |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Thank you. We are             |
| 25 | going to move right on through.                    |
| 26 | MS. GIARDANO: Okay.                                |

| 1  | MR.DOBBINS: I think I can speak loud                 |
|----|--|
| 2  | enough so that everyone can hear me. If you can't I  |
| 3  | am sure you will let me know.                        |
| 4  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Good evening.                   |
| 5  | MR. DOBBINS: Good evening.                           |
| 6  | I have been called an expert tonight. I              |
| 7  | have been told that an ex is a has been and spurt is |
| 8  | a drip under pressure.                               |
| 9  | (Laughter.)  |
| 10 | MR. DOBBINS: I used to be the former                 |
| 11 | director of planning here in D.C. and I feel a       |
| 12 | little bit under pressure on this side of the table. |
| 13 | Good evening Madame Chair and members of             |
| 14 | the Zoning Commission and staff. For the record my   |
| 15 | name is Al Dobbins. I am an urban planning           |
| 16 | consultant and I am located in the District of       |
| 17 | Columbia. Tonight I am representing the applicant    |
| 18 | in this case and I will speak to the proposed PUDs   |
| 19 | consistency with the District's elements of the      |
| 20 | comprehensive plan.                                  |
| 21 | I have given you a fairly detailed                   |
| 22 | outline of my testimony that leads to a conclusion   |
| 23 | that I hope the Commission will support. However in  |
| 24 | the interest of time I will summarize as much as     |
| 25 | possible.  |
| 26 | Given the tenure of some of the members              |

26

| 1  | of the Commission, you probably know more about the  |
|----|--|
| 2  | comprehensive plan than I do. However, with all due  |
| 3  | respect, I would like to emphasize three important   |
| 4  | points that are found in the general and land use    |
| 5  | elements of the plan.                                |
| 6  | First, the comprehensive plan is a long              |
| 7  | range plan. I think the Office of Planning is as     |
| 8  | much as a 20 year plan. And as such it is a general  |
| 9  | policy document. And a guide intended to establish   |
| 10 | broad policies and goals while affording flexibility |
| 11 | for future implementation.                           |
| 12 | Second the elements of the plan should               |
| 13 | be interpreted in concert with each other and should |
| 14 | be interpreted broadly.                              |
| 15 | And third, while the land use element is             |
| 16 | given greater weight, then the other elements, it    |
| 17 | does not identify or fix every use, height, and      |
| 18 | density on every block in the District.              |
| 19 | Now with these points in mind and the                |
| 20 | following testimony, I believe that it is reasonable |
| 21 | to conclude that proposed PUD is consistent with the |
| 22 | long range mixed use goals of the land use element   |
| 23 | of the comprehensive plan. And is consistent with    |
| 24 | the other comprehensive plan elements that support   |
| 25 | the ten major themes.                                |
| 26 | Now I would like to explain why I have               |

| 1  | come to this conclusion. Since some of the           |
|----|--|
| 2  | comprehensive plan text information in my written    |
| 3  | submission was included in previous submissions, I   |
| 4  | will keep my remarks brief in those areas. However,  |
| 5  | there are important points to made in some detail    |
| 6  | when considering the proposals consistency with the  |
| 7  | land use map and the land use policy map. The        |
| 8  | proposed PUD supports six major themes of the        |
| 9  | comprehensive plan. It increases employment          |
| 10 | opportunities. It promotes the city's natural        |
| 11 | amenities. It improves the physical characteristics  |
| 12 | of the District. It preserves and insures community  |
| 13 | input. And it provides for diversity and overall     |
| 14 | social responsibility. And I would also like to      |
| 15 | point out that the latter theme, providing for       |
| 16 | diversity and overall social responsibility is one   |
| 17 | that the Commission probably doesn't hear very often |
| 18 | when considering PUD applications.                   |
| 19 | The PUD is supported by provisions in                |
| 20 | the economic development, transportation, urban      |
| 21 | design, human services, and land use elements of the |
| 22 | comprehensive plan. It brings new development to     |
| 23 | the South Capitol Street/Buzzard Point area. It      |
| 24 | provides developer funded shuttle service to the     |
| 25 | Navy Yard Metrorail station. It promotes water       |
| 26 | oriented public spaces. It encourages a partnership  |

| 1          | between the community and the private sector working |
|------------|--|
| 2          | together to provide essential services to the youth  |
| 3          | of the city. And it encourages a diversity of land   |
| 4          | uses in the Central Employment Area outside of       |
| 5          | downtown.  |
| 6          | The proposed PUD is supported by                     |
| 7          | provisions in the Ward 2 and Ward 6 elements of the  |
| 8          | comprehensive plan. In Ward 2 it will provide jobs   |
| 9          | in the Central Employment Area and the Buzzard       |
| LO         | Point/Near Southeast Development Opportunity Area.   |
| .1         | It will provide a water recreation center on the     |
| .2         | Anacostia's west bank. It will help meet the human   |
| .3         | needs of the city's youth. It will provide for       |
| .4         | public access and use of the Anacostia waterfront.   |
| .5         | And it will serve as a major driver for other        |
| <b>L</b> 6 | development in the area.                             |
| L7         | In the Ward 6 plan it will enhance                   |
| 18         | Metrorail ridership and provide commercial, open     |
| .9         | space, education, and recreation development that    |
| 20         | offers the best hope of jump starting residential    |
| 21         | development. Thus achieving the mixture of use       |
| 22         | specified in the land use elements of the plan.      |
| 23         | Now turning to the land use map and the              |
| 24         | land use policies map. The proposed PUD is not       |
| 25         | inconsistent with the mixed use goals of the         |
| 26         | generalized land use map which designates the site   |

| 1  | and a large surrounding area, high density           |
|----|--|
| 2  | residential, medium high density commercial, and     |
| 3  | PTE, commonly referred to as industrial. It is not   |
| 4  | inconsistent for four reasons. It will facilitate    |
| 5  | the future development of residential uses, which    |
| 6  | will not be feasible until the existing area is      |
| 7  | cleaned up and until people come to the area. And    |
| 8  | at least some portion of the current industrial uses |
| 9  | are phased out.                                      |
| 10 | It will facilitate the development of an             |
| 11 | office building and retail uses which will draw      |
| 12 | substantial numbers of employees and visitors into   |
| 13 | the area during the day, on weekends, and in the     |
| 14 | evening.   |
| 15 | It will begin to phase out two highly                |
| 16 | visible industrial operations on key waterfront      |
| 17 | sites.   |
| 18 | And finally it will facilitate open                  |
| 19 | space and education uses which will draw youth and   |
| 20 | visitors to the area, again during the day, on       |
| 21 | weekends, and in the evening. And I think we all     |
| 22 | hope that many of these visitors will be D.C.        |
| 23 | residents who will consider becoming future          |
| 24 | residents of the area.                               |
| 25 | Now with respect to the generalized land             |
| 26 | use policies map, the proposed PUD is consistent     |

| 1  | with its designation of a Central Employment Area   |
|----|---|
| 2  | and a development opportunity area. The proposed    |
| 3  | PUD will develop office and retail space for 5,700  |
| 4  | jobs in the core area. Thus achieving one of the    |
| 5  | primary objectives of the Central Employment Area.  |
| 6  | The proposed PUD will jumpstart new                 |
| 7  | mixed use growth and development in the Buzzard     |
| 8  | Point/Near Southeast area. Thus meeting one of the  |
| 9  | most important objectives of that metropolitan      |
| 10 | development opportunity area. It will do by         |
| 11 | providing a shuttle which will create a sense of    |
| 12 | security along Half Street and at the Metrorail     |
| 13 | station. And provide ridership for an underutilized |
| 14 | Metrorail system. It will provide transportation    |
| 15 | improvements which will improve traffic flow for    |
| 16 | future development.                                 |
| 17 | The proposed PUD will provide a maritme             |
| 18 | center and will play a key role in cleaning up the  |
| 19 | environment and promoting the Anacostia river.      |
| 20 | Finally the proposed PUD will create                |
| 21 | waterfront recreational uses that will become very  |
| 22 | significant public amenities which can serve as a   |
| 23 | beacon for future residential uses.                 |
| 24 | Now having said all of this I hope you              |
| 25 | will not disagree that the proposed PUD is not      |
| 26 | inconsistent with the general policy guidance and   |

| 1  | goals of the comprehensive plan text and maps. In    |
|----|--|
| 2  | addition the proposed PUD will strengthen the        |
| 3  | Capital Gateway Group's initiative to upgrade the    |
| 4  | areas. It will reinforce the partnerships between    |
| 5  | Florida Rock Properties, the ECC, and the community  |
| 6  | at large. And finally it represents an ultimate      |
| 7  | balancing of competing urban design and mixed use    |
| 8  | objectives for the area.                             |
| 9  | Given the area's current conditions, the             |
| 10 | urban design objectives of maximizing views and      |
| 11 | access to the waterfront and the human services      |
| 12 | objectives of improving the well being of the youth  |
| 13 | should take precedence over immediate mixed use      |
| 14 | goals which can and will be satisfied in the future  |
| 15 | on the waterfront and on alternative interior sites. |
| 16 | Thank you very much and I will be happy              |
| 17 | to answer any questions you might have.              |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Thank you Mr.                   |
| 19 | Dobbins. Was there another                           |
| 20 | MS. GIARDANO: We have two ECC                        |
| 21 | representatives that we would like to speak and they |
| 22 | have a short video presentation. While they are      |
| 23 | setting that up I just want to introduce their       |
| 24 | remarks. The applicant since the previous Zoning     |
| 25 | Commission hearing has learned a lot more about the  |
| 26 | ECC Maritime Center proposal, which is modelled      |

| 1  | after the Living Classroom project in the Inner     |
|----|---|
| 2  | Harbor in Baltimore. The ECC has also undertaken    |
| 3  | since the last hearing a community outreach effort  |
| 4  | to acquaint the community with that proposal. And   |
| 5  | that effort included numerous tours of the facility |
| 6  | in the Inner Harbor. And you will see some footage  |
| 7  | of that proposal on the tape.                       |
| 8  | We have at this point, we have really               |
| 9  | come to fully appreciate the benefits of the        |
| 10 | Maritime Center for the area. These include         |
| 11 | providing an active recreational use on the         |
| 12 | waterfront and drawing visitors to the area. Our    |
| 13 | new proposal fully embraces this concept for the    |
| 14 | entirety of square 664. With that I will turn it    |
| 15 | over to Bob Nixon and Mark Davis.                   |
| 16 | MR. NIXON: Mark was out of the room                 |
| 17 | when people were being sworn.                       |
| 18 | MS. GIARDANO: Can we swear him in?                  |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Is there anyone                |
| 20 | else who plans to testify who was not sworn in?     |
| 21 | Anyone else who plans to testify who was not sworn  |
| 22 | in? Okay, let's do them all together.               |
| 23 | (Whereupon, the witnesses were sworn.)              |
| 24 | MR. NIXON: Thank you Madame Chairwoman              |
| 25 | and Commissioners. I appreciate the opportunity to  |
| 26 | be back here this evening. With me is Mark Davis    |

| 1  | who is the chief operating officer of the Earth      |
|----|--|
| 2  | Conservation Corps. What we would like to do, I      |
| 3  | would just like to say a few remarks, show the       |
| 4  | videotape  |
| 5  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Could you identify              |
| 6  | yourself for the record?                             |
| 7  | I am Bob Nixon. I am the executive                   |
| 8  | director of the Earth Conservation Corps which began |
| 9  | work in 1992 working with young residents of Ward 6, |
| 10 | 7, and 8 restoring the Anacostia river and teaching  |
| 11 | life skills. I have been the executive director      |
| 12 | since 1998 (sic). What I would like to say is this   |
| 13 | maritime center, the use of 664, I think is just a   |
| 14 | fantastic opportunity to bring what is one of the    |
| 15 | most effective and recognized educational tools that |
| 16 | has been used in various places around the world to  |
| 17 | our city, our nations capital, for all members, for  |
| 18 | all the residents and to provide a job training      |
| 19 | facility through boat restoration and GED programs   |
| 20 | and such, to all the citizens, but also particularly |
| 21 | those residents that live close by and who we work   |
| 22 | with on a daily basis.                               |
| 23 | I would like you to see the videotape                |
| 24 | and then I would like to address some issues of why  |
| 25 | we think we can make this facility that everyone     |
| 26 | will be proud of. And Mark will have some comments   |

| 1  | also.  |  |
|----|--------|--|
| 2  |        | (Whereupon, a video presentation was     |
| 3  | made.) |  |
| 4  |        | NARRATOR: Two rivers run through here.   |
| 5  |        | The Potomac, a river that runs past      |
| 6  |        | great presidents and green parks. A      |
| 7  |        | river brought back by a cleanup          |
| 8  |        | campaign, brought back for fishing, and  |
| 9  |        | boating.                                 |
| 10 |        | And the Anacostia, the other river. A    |
| 11 |        | river of industrial plants, persistent   |
| 12 |        | pollution and little public access. Now  |
| 13 |        | a cleanup campaign is bringing back this |
| 14 |        | river also. A cleanup by young men and   |
| 15 |        | women who live in public housing nearby. |
| 16 |        | Hard workers who can't find jobs here in |
| 17 |        | their own home town, in the nation's     |
| 18 |        | capital.                                 |
| 19 |        | VOICE ON VIDEO: Finally, tonight, the    |
| 20 |        | bald eagle, the national symbol of       |
| 21 |        | America. In Washington, D.C. you can     |
| 22 |        | find images of eagles everywhere, but    |
| 23 |        | you couldn't find any live eagles there  |
| 24 |        | for the past 60 years. Now a project     |
| 25 |        | run by the Earth Conservation Corps is   |
| 26 |        | bringing eagles back to the District of  |

| 1  | Columbia and using young people from the             |
|----|--|
| 2  | city's poorest neighborhood to help.                 |
| 3  | Over the last six weeks four three month             |
| 4  | old eaglets have been living in a                    |
| 5  | homemade refuge on D.C.'s troubled                   |
| 6  | southeast side.                                      |
| 7  | The birds are being fed, nurtured, and               |
| 8  | prepared for flight by 12 high school                |
| 9  | dropouts, who are also being prepared                |
| 10 | for the future.                                      |
| 11 | VOICE ON VIDEO: We give these young men              |
| 12 | and women an opportunity to do really                |
| 13 | important habitat restoration work,                  |
| 14 | solve an environmental problem, and                  |
| 15 | learn job skills.                                    |
| 16 | VOICE ON VIDEO: It's what we had to do.              |
| 17 | Manual, build stuff, you know, work with             |
| 18 | my hands.  |
| 19 | MR. NIXON: I would like to thank all of              |
| 20 | the committee members who have been up to the Living |
| 21 | Classroom and participated in this educational       |
| 22 | effort. I am going to turn it over to Mark for a     |
| 23 | moment before I talk about our capacity to make this |
| 24 | happen.  |
| 25 | MR. DAVIS: Thank you very much. It is                |
| 26 | an honor to be here this evening. Before I begin I   |

| 1  | am messenger for Dorthea Farrel of Barry Farm        |
|----|--|
| 2  | Resident Council and also Jackie Masaday, they sent  |
| 3  | letters in this evening because they couldn't attend |
| 4  | themselves and ask me to deliver them to you.        |
| 5  | My name is Mark davis and I am the chief             |
| 6  | operating officer of the Earth Conservation Corps.   |
| 7  | And I would like to briefly talk to you about the    |
| 8  | benefits of this type of program from an educational |
| 9  | perspective and what it means to the youth of today. |
| 10 | I have been involved in education for the last 20    |
| 11 | years of my life, primarily in alternative classroom |
| 12 | settings, as well as teaching in traditional         |
| 13 | academic settings, both here in the U.S. and         |
| 14 | overseas. In each of these settings I have felt      |
| 15 | that the hands-on or the experiential learning       |
| 16 | component is what really had the most impact on the  |
| 17 | students I worked with, whether they came from       |
| 18 | disadvantaged backgrounds, whether they had learning |
| 19 | disabilities, or whether they were exceptionally     |
| 20 | bright and on their way to Harvard at age 15. They   |
| 21 | all learn very successfully in this type of          |
| 22 | environment.   |
| 23 | Just recently in the publication                     |
| 24 | Soundings, which is a nationwide boating newspaper,  |
| 25 | there was a very large article dedicated to hands on |
| 26 | learning, marine education program. It profiled      |

| 1  | approximately 25 programs within our country, the     |
|----|---|
| 2  | Living Classroom is one, and demonstrates their       |
| 3  | success through a variety of statistics, what         |
| 4  | happens. In one case it found that with a group of    |
| 5  | female students that their grade point average        |
| 6  | actually went up $1/3$ and that all of them graduated |
| 7  | from high school for those students that involved in  |
| 8  | the program compared to a test group that was not     |
| 9  | involved in the program.                              |
| 10 | I could recite statistic upon statistic               |
| 11 | for you about how this program would be successful    |
| 12 | from the methodology and the point of view for the    |
| 13 | children. But I would like to address most crisply    |
| 14 | for you this evening is exactly what ECC can do,      |
| 15 | when they con do it, and how they can do it, at this  |
| 16 | particular site over the course of the next three,    |
| 17 | five, and ten years. One of the things that we can    |
| 18 | start right away with this particular program is a    |
| 19 | marine science program, a day program, which could    |
| 20 | be use by students from kindergarten through 12th     |
| 21 | grade. For this particular situation, until we        |
| 22 | acquire a large enough research boat take our own     |
| 23 | people out we could partner with the Chesapeake Bay   |
| 24 | Foundation. And they could up the river and dock at   |
| 25 | our facility to take school groups out.               |
| 26 | A second boat we would like to pursue                 |

| 1  | and plan to pursue is an 80 foot sail ship which is  |
|----|--|
| 2  | one of the primary reasons why it needs to be below  |
| 3  | the Frederick Douglass Bridge because the mast is so |
| 4  | high they wouldn't let us get in and out of there    |
| 5  | two times a day. You have to give them 24 hours      |
| 6  | notice and they don't like to have that bridge open  |
| 7  | too much. But this particular boat, as with the 30   |
| 8  | foot research vessel would hold approximately 25     |
| 9  | students each. And we could do two trips a day with  |
| 10 | these students. Therefore, we would be serving       |
| 11 | approximately 100 students a day in this program.    |
| 12 | Factoring in bad weather, holidays, the 180 day a    |
| 13 | year school calendar that we have, estimate that we  |
| 14 | could take children out on the water at a minimum of |
| 15 | 130 days per year. That translates to 13,000 K       |
| 16 | through 12 students participating in just this one   |
| 17 | program all year long.                               |
| 18 | Of course there will be other                        |
| 19 | opportunities for other groups of individuals, young |
| 20 | adults, middle aged adults, and senior citizens to   |
| 21 | have the types of experience, perhaps during evening |
| 22 | programs or weekend programs. That particular        |
| 23 | program we could start in March or April, as soon as |
| 24 | we had enough space available to us with the phase   |
| 25 | out procedure of the current aggregate operation     |
| 26 | there to be able to dock vessels and bring school    |

| 1  | children in safely to get on the boat and off the    |
|----|--|
| 2  | boat.  |
| 3  | A second component of this program would             |
| 4  | be the sailing center. This particular program       |
| 5  | would also be a day program, for teens, adults, and  |
| 6  | seniors. We estimate that with this type of program  |
| 7  | that we would reach upwards of 200 participants per  |
| 8  | year, or per season really, it could be quite        |
| 9  | seasonal in this regard. And all we need here again  |
| 10 | is some dock area, we could start this program full  |
| 11 | time by late spring, early summer of next year. One  |
| 12 | of the concepts that I had, that I think is very     |
| 13 | exciting, is I would like to see sailing teams       |
| 14 | representing each of the different neighborhoods     |
| 15 | that we work in, Arthur Kapper, Potomac Gardens, all |
| 16 | around us. I would like to see different sailing     |
| 17 | teams so we could have our own regatta there on the  |
| 18 | Anacostia each week. And it teaches a lot of         |
| 19 | discipline and a lot leadership which is very, very  |
| 20 | powerful in the formulation of young adult self-     |
| 21 | esteem and their ability to focus and get things     |
| 22 | done in their lives.                                 |
| 23 | A third component would be boat                      |
| 24 | building. This would be about the third year, where  |
| 25 | we have the opportunity to have enough space         |
| 26 | available to us with the phase out of the operation  |

| 1  | to build a facility to begin boat building            |
|----|---|
| 2  | operation. It would allow us a three year time        |
| 3  | frame in which we would be able to have boats         |
| 4  | donated to us that we could work on. And this         |
| 5  | particular program would serve primarily young        |
| 6  | adults, 18 to 25 years old. It is an 11 month         |
| 7  | program. This would be a full core program, \$1,700   |
| 8  | of work that they would have to put in with us.       |
| 9  | Upon completion of this program they would receive a  |
| 10 | \$4,700 education award to go on to higher education. |
| 11 | And while they were with us they would also receive   |
| 12 | a stipend, a living stipend to help them with their   |
| 13 | expenses.   |
| 14 | During this process they would have life              |
| 15 | skills, and leadership training, and GED training if  |
| 16 | they didn't already have their GED, standard first    |
| 17 | aid, CPR training, boat license courses, job          |
| 18 | training readiness.                                   |
| 19 | This particular plan we can implement                 |
| 20 | very easily within the next three to five years.      |
| 21 | And starting by next spring you would easily see a    |
| 22 | tremendous amount of activity in that area. The       |
| 23 | ling range plan of the large maritime education       |
| 24 | center that employ encompass upwards of 40,000        |
| 25 | square feet with laboratories and classroom is what   |
| 26 | the would be accomplished during the second five      |

| 1  | years of this particular plan. Once we are able to   |
|----|--|
| 2  | have the volume of students coming through our       |
| 3  | program every year and for the community to see the  |
| 4  | tremendous outcome that will happen with their       |
| 5  | children young adults and seniors alike by           |
| 6  | participating in this type of program, then it could |
| 7  | have a tremendous impact on the community at large   |
| 8  | and be part of the whole revitalization of this area |
| 9  | based on the Florida Rock PUD.                       |
| 10 | MR. NIXON: Thank you, Mark.                          |
| 11 | I would like to just a few more                      |
| 12 | points. Just to clarify the phasing aspect. We       |
| 13 | have received a commitment in writing from Florida   |
| 14 | Rock that they will donate half of the site to ECC   |
| 15 | on approval of the PUD and then ten years out from   |
| 16 | that we would receive the other half. So it          |
| 17 | phase 1 would be ten years and then we would we      |
| 18 | are talking a ten year window.                       |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Half of which                   |
| 20 | site?  |
| 21 | MR. NIXON: Six-six-four. A little over               |
| 22 | one acre. For all the programs that Mark described   |
| 23 | we would wait until the second and once we built     |
| 24 | that to capacity then we move into the second stage. |
| 25 | We would design the whole program with the concept   |
| 26 | of a maritime educational campus in mind, looking at |

| 1  | the whole site, phased in.                           |
|----|--|
| 2  | On the other side of things, we also are             |
| 3  | soon to be a Taniff training center site, the Earth  |
| 4  | Conservation Corps. And we will a lot of these       |
| 5  | life skill programs will also shorter term duration  |
| 6  | for residents who are anxious to move into the       |
| 7  | workforce. And one of the beauties of this whole     |
| 8  | partnership I think is the ability for the Earth     |
| 9  | Conservation Corps which by just faith is hard       |
| 10 | against the site in the pumphouse, we can provide    |
| 11 | job training for community residents and have the    |
| 12 | lead time to get them ready to compete in the market |
| 13 | place for the jobs at this construction site will    |
| 14 | provide. So I think it is a very the youth of        |
| 15 | the whole region and the local residents both        |
| 16 | benefit. I think it really a dynamic opportunity.    |
| 17 | Thank you.   |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Does that conclude              |
| 19 | your   |
| 20 | (Pause.)   |
| 21 | MR. NIXON: I would also just like to                 |
| 22 | talk about why I think we can do this. First of      |
| 23 | all, we are talking about Florida Rock is donating   |
| 24 | the land. I want to be clear to everyone, which      |
| 25 | means they are giving us the land and also the       |
| 26 | privilege of having to out and approximately \$5     |

| 1  | million. So thank you very much.                      |
|----|---|
| 2  | (Laughter.)   |
| 3  | MR. NIXON: I think I began the Earth                  |
| 4  | Conservation Corps in 1992 with a \$50,000 dollar     |
| 5  | grant from Coors Pure Water 2000. The young men and   |
| 6  | women you saw from Valley Green were the first nine   |
| 7  | Corps members. We were really working out of my car   |
| 8  | and since that time we have raised over \$9.5 million |
| 9  | to work in cash to put youth to work in the           |
| 10 | environment. And our overhead costs have been 16      |
| 11 | percent. And we are about action and getting things   |
| 12 | done. We are sort of very low overhead and we have    |
| 13 | a great staff the makes it happen. And the work is    |
| 14 | done by Corps who have a tremendous amount to be      |
| 15 | proud of, some of them are here this evening. And I   |
| 16 | am very proud of them.                                |
| 17 | And our success continues. Last week we               |
| 18 | were informed by Americorps that we are getting a     |
| 19 | \$1,400,000 grant and will have approximately 130     |
| 20 | full time Americorps positions. We have a             |
| 21 | tremendous sort of bank of partners. Mrs. Robert      |
| 22 | Kennedy is on our Board of Directors and is the       |
| 23 | chairman of the fundraising committee for this        |
| 24 | project. Many of you know that she is a dedicated     |
| 25 | sailor as well as resident, long time resident of     |
| 26 | Washington, and loves this project and is extremely   |

| 1  | committed to making this happen.                     |
|----|--|
| 2  | And we have done all this really with                |
| 3  | not a finally the city gave us the pumphouse         |
| 4  | three years ago but without a real home base.        |
| 5  | And the Florida Rock commitment of this land gives   |
| 6  | us truly a incredibly solid launching pad to jump    |
| 7  | off of from what we have already accomplished. So I  |
| 8  | am convinced that we can make this happen. We have   |
| 9  | the experts at the Living Classroom Foundation and   |
| 10 | really around the country who do this type of thing  |
| 11 | and are really committed to see it happen in         |
| 12 | Washington.  |
| 13 | Thank you.   |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Thank you, Mr.                  |
| 15 | Nixon.   |
| 16 | Does the wrap up your                                |
| 17 | MS. GIARDANO: That wraps it up. And if               |
| 18 | there are any questions from the Commission. Let me  |
| 19 | also note that Mr. Anderson, president of Florida    |
| 20 | Rock is here again this evening, if there are any    |
| 21 | questions.   |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Dobbins, I am               |
| 23 | going to start with you. And then I am going to let  |
| 24 | my colleagues move on with their own questions       |
| 25 | because I see a number of orange tabs in Mr. Parsons |
| 26 | book here and have a feeling that he is going look   |

| 1  | at them one by one.                                  |
|----|--|
| 2  | Let me ask you this, when the                        |
| 3  | generalized land use plan says high density          |
| 4  | residential and we don't and we submit a PUD that    |
| 5  | doesn't have any what would you suggest that we use  |
| 6  | as a rationale? You gave us some, one of says that   |
| 7  | you know, what the plan calls for won't work here,   |
| 8  | there needs to be some kind of flexibility and       |
| 9  | inauguration of uses in a particular area that will  |
| 10 | an atmosphere where the use is called for in the     |
| 11 | comprehensive to work. There was a time when we had  |
| 12 | difficulty with the comprehensive plan and we wanted |
| 13 | to make sure we weren't inconsistent in the Fort     |
| 14 | Totten case. And one of the things that we cited     |
| 15 | was the comprehensive plan's silence on how do you   |
| 16 | preserve needed industrial uses and so on. And so    |
| 17 | we used that as a rationale for doing what we        |
| 18 | thought was the best thing in that particular case,  |
| 19 | without being scathingly inconsistent. In this       |
| 20 | instance there is nothing that I know of, and you    |
| 21 | probably are much more conversant of the             |
| 22 | comprehensive plan than I, that calls for            |
| 23 | transitional flexibility when an area's total        |
| 24 | character is about to be changes, or is called for   |
| 25 | to be changed. The kind of flexibility that will     |
| 26 | allow for a smoother transition for that change to   |

| 1  | take place. How do we do what is on its face,        |
|----|--|
| 2  | grossly inconsistent and yet get the job done, I     |
| 3  | mean help with the transitional change that I think  |
| 4  | it calls for and we all want to see?                 |
| 5  | MR. DOBBINS: Well, I think clearly it                |
| 6  | is a judgement call, first of all. I do believe,     |
| 7  | one of the reasons why I began my presentation by    |
| 8  | calling attention to the fact that the plan is a 20  |
| 9  | year plan and its policies are broad and it really   |
| 10 | provides a broad guidance to the city is the fact    |
| 11 | that the plan is intended to afford some flexibility |
| 12 | in making decisions given the particular conditions  |
| 13 | that the city finds itself in and the Zoning         |
| 14 | Commission finds itself in.                          |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: And we have used                |
| 16 | all of those.  |
| 17 | MR. DOBBINS: I am sure you have.                     |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: We have used every              |
| 19 | single one.  |
| 20 | MR. DOBBINS: So for those reasons I                  |
| 21 | don't think that it is necessary for there to be     |
| 22 | explicit flexibility.                                |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Let me go to the                |
| 24 | next step. Let's assume that we are satisfied with   |
| 25 | some sort of rationale that we can up with, which we |
| 26 | have a few things. Where do you start? This is the   |

| 1  | question that posed to Ms. Ambrose. Do you let this  |
|----|--|
| 2  | PUD go forward as proposed and you start with the    |
| 3  | next PUD? Do you tell the next people that wait a    |
| 4  | minute we already got somebody with we got to change |
| 5  | to the environment, so you can't come back to us     |
| 6  | with the environment is not quite ready yet, or is   |
| 7  | the next PUD, or the one after that?                 |
| 8  | MR. DOBBINS: Well, as a                              |
| 9  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Do you see our                  |
| 10 | dilemma?   |
| 11 | MR. DOBBINS: I see your dilemma. And                 |
| 12 | it is not just your dilemma and it is not just your  |
| 13 | dilemma. It is the city's dilemma and it is the      |
| 14 | Office of Planning's dilemma. Because the truth be   |
| 15 | said there is no plan for that area. And I think     |
| 16 | that if you had an explicit plan you could make the  |
| 17 | decisions that you need to making much more          |
| 18 | confidently. I mean there are ideas and notions and  |
| 19 | visions, but there is no formally adopted plan for   |
| 20 | the area.  |
| 21 | I think that with this PUD and with the              |
| 22 | PUDs or proposals that might come in the future, it  |
| 23 | is incumbent upon the city to develop a more         |
| 24 | explicit plan for that area that would give you      |
| 25 | better guidance. But until that happens, as the      |
| 26 | councilwoman gaid and ag others have gaid you are    |

| 1  | really faced with making a decision on a project by  |
|----|--|
| 2  | project basis.                                       |
| 3  | I would also add in response to your                 |
| 4  | first question that really deep in my heart, I truly |
| 5  | believe that this project goes a long way for        |
| 6  | actually bringing the high density residential that  |
| 7  | we all want to see in that area. And that in sense   |
| 8  | it is consistent with the comprehensive plan. I      |
| 9  | mean the general provisions of the plan state        |
| 10 | specifically that the land use element does not      |
| 11 | necessarily have to apply to each and every parcel   |
| 12 | in the District. That is explicitly stated.          |
| 13 | And I think that by approving this PUD               |
| 14 | what you are really doing is hastening the           |
| 15 | development of residential in that area by providing |
| 16 | an environment for residential development to        |
| 17 | flourish.  |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: All right. Thank                |
| 19 | you very much.                                       |
| 20 | MS. GIARDANO: Can I just make                        |
| 21 | additional comments. Mixed use zoning, and it        |
| 22 | doesn't just say high density residential, it also   |
| 23 | says commercial, has been interpreted to mean it     |
| 24 | doesn't have to be a mix of uses on every site. And  |
| 25 | even the OP overlay proposal for the CR zoning       |
| 26 | allows for some site to be commercial and some sites |

| 1  | to be residential. It is not like the DD where       |
|----|--|
| 2  | there is a requirement of uses on every site. So I   |
| 3  | think we are consistent if the OP plan is consistent |
| 4  | with the comprehensive plan mixed use                |
| 5  | interpretation.                                      |
| 6  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Yes, I have used                |
| 7  | those arguments, I am telling you I know the         |
| 8  | arguments. We used them in the West End and where    |
| 9  | else did we use those arguments, Mr. Parsons?        |
| 10 | MR. PARSONS: To this degree, never.                  |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Well, okay, we                  |
| 12 | have use the arguments, perhaps not to this degree,  |
| 13 | but I know for sure we have used them. And we        |
| 14 | understand that we need to look at the plan in       |
| 15 | totality. We understand that we can permit whole     |
| 16 | commercial or total any one use in a mixed use zone, |
| 17 | on a particular lot provided the character of the    |
| 18 | entire home is preserved and as envisioned in the    |
| 19 | comprehensive plan, all of that stuff. We have said  |
| 20 | that. We have done that before. This is a little     |
| 21 | different. What I had asked the questions was to     |
| 22 | see if you could give us any help on that.           |
| 23 | MR. DOBBINS: I hope I have.                          |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Has yet to be                   |
| 25 | seen.  |
| 26 | Mr. Franklin.  |

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 (202) 234-4433 (202) 234-4433

| 1  | MR. FRANKLIN: I think Mr. Dobbin does                |
|----|--|
| 2  | provide counsel, in all deference to the chair and   |
| 3  | who I respect, I don't have a dilemma. I mean the    |
| 4  | comprehensive plan is comprehensive. And if it were  |
| 5  | to guide us parcel by parcel we wouldn't have to     |
| 6  | sitting around, there would be no need for a zoning  |
| 7  | commission. We are supposed to take as I understand  |
| 8  | it the general thrust of these comprehensive plans   |
| 9  | and apply as best we can to the facts as we see them |
| 10 | parcel by parcel in the case of a PUD situation. So  |
| 11 | I am not at all perhaps in contrast to my colleague  |
| 12 | at the far end, I am not concerned at all. I think   |
| 13 | that we might have a PUD here that starts off with   |
| 14 | commercial we might have another one, and another    |
| 15 | one after that until it becomes apparent what the    |
| 16 | character of the area is becoming. And that is what  |
| 17 | we are supposed to be doing. We are supposed to be   |
| 18 | absorbing the facts as best we can in relationship   |
| 19 | to individual sites and as you said earlier making a |
| 20 | judgement call that is as best as we can make it not |
| 21 | inconsistent with and incidentally it doesn't        |
| 22 | say, "consistent with", it says, "not inconsistent   |
| 23 | with." Maybe only lawyers regard that as             |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: We have used that               |
| 25 | one too.   |
|    |  |

(Laughter.)

| 1  | MR. FRANKLIN: And that is standard                   |
|----|--|
| 2  | language in the standard zoning enabling acts        |
| 3  | throughout the country because the it was recognized |
| 4  | we could not slavishly adhering to plans that may    |
| 5  | really have as you stated perfectly correctly, it is |
| 6  | stated as visions rather than plans. So I am not     |
| 7  | concerned at all about that. And I thank you for     |
| 8  | your illumination.                                   |
| 9  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Do you have any                 |
| 10 | other questions of them?                             |
| 11 | MR. FRANKLIN: I just wanted to ask mr.               |
| 12 | Buckley, we are now looking at a project that is in  |
| 13 | two building instead of one?                         |
| 14 | MR. BUCKLEY: Correct.                                |
| 15 | MR. FRANKLIN: And is that something                  |
| 16 | that is consistent with what you understand the DOT  |
| 17 | requirements to be? Are they concerned about having  |
| 18 | the minimum square feet in one structure or do they  |
| 19 | not care?  |
| 20 | MR. BUCKLEY: We have been advised that               |
| 21 | they would accept the two building scheme. So it is  |
| 22 | not inconsistent with what their needs are.          |
| 23 | MR. FRANKLIN: This may be a question                 |
| 24 | that is more apt for Mr. Anderson, but it seems to   |
| 25 | me that if you do not get the DOT award, is it your  |
| 26 | feeling that having reconfigured the building into   |

| 1  | two separate buildings of roughly a half million     |
|----|--|
| 2  | square feet, would make it easier to market to other |
| 3  | tenants?   |
| 4  | MR. BUCKLEY: Okay can I just the two                 |
| 5  | buildings represent 1,530,000 square feet.           |
| 6  | MR. FRANKLIN: Total?                                 |
| 7  | MR. BUCKLEY: Total.                                  |
| 8  | MR. FRANKLIN: And each is about a half               |
| 9  | million plus.  |
| 10 | MR. BUCKLEY: Three quarters.                         |
| 11 | MR. FRANKLIN: Three quarters, okay.                  |
| 12 | MR. BUCKLEY: Mr. Haase do you want to                |
| 13 | comment on this?                                     |
| 14 | MR. HAASE: I do think that if the DOT                |
| 15 | does not come down there, that the large size is     |
| 16 | very attractive to GSA because if you look at the    |
| 17 | availability of space in the District of Columbia    |
| 18 | right now, we find that there is very little large   |
| 19 | space available.                                     |
| 20 | MR. FRANKLIN: Do you see a private                   |
| 21 | tenant being attracted to this site?                 |
| 22 | MR. HAASE: Not at this time.                         |
| 23 | MR. FRANKLIN: So if it is not DOT, it                |
| 24 | will have to be some other federal agency.           |
| 25 | MR. HAASE: Yes. Or several agencies.                 |
| 26 | MR. FRANKLIN: And how would that be                  |

| 1  | something that GSA would arrange? Are there other     |
|----|---|
| 2  | prospective   |
| 3  | MR. HAASE: Yes. They have an advanced                 |
| 4  | acquisition program that is trying to develop a pool  |
| 5  | of large space for leases that are coming due. This   |
| 6  | is an opportune time, members of the Commission       |
| 7  | because there are so many leases that are starting    |
| 8  | to roll over and buildings are getting aged in the    |
| 9  | District of Columbia and they are looking for some    |
| 10 | new space, large space.                               |
| 11 | MR. PROST: I think there is one other                 |
| 12 | issue with regard to timing. My name is James         |
| 13 | Prost. There is one other issue with regards to       |
| 14 | timing and that is the reason the tax bill that was   |
| 15 | passed and the advantages that also creates in the    |
| 16 | District in terms the enterprise zone, and this       |
| 17 | particular site is in the enterprise zone section     |
| 18 | that would be subject to a tax credit for             |
| 19 | employment, so this particular site is advantaged     |
| 20 | from a private sector perspective in the sense that   |
| 21 | there is a \$3,000 per employee annual tax credit for |
| 22 | District residents in this particular site. It is     |
| 23 | the largest available site in the District that is    |
| 24 | under the 20 percent and above poverty factor within  |
| 25 | the enterprise zone.                                  |
|    |   |

So I think it does create another

| 1  | marketing advantage that people don't yet realize   |
|----|---|
| 2  | and are realizing very quickly right now.           |
| 3  | MR. FRANKLIN: That is \$3,000 per                   |
| 4  | employee  |
| 5  | MR. PROST: Per year.                                |
| 6  | MR. FRANKLIN: Per year.                             |
| 7  | MR. PROST: For five years.                          |
| 8  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: For D.C                        |
| 9  | MR. PROST: For D.C. residents only.                 |
| 10 | Correct.  |
| .1 | MR. FRANKLIN: Which goes on without                 |
| 12 | limitation, is there a time limit?                  |
| L3 | MR. PROST: For five years.                          |
| _4 | MR. FRANKLIN: That's all I have.                    |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: All right. Mr.                 |
| L6 | Parsons.  |
| 17 | MR. PARSONS: Mr. Dobbins, the Capital               |
| 18 | Gateway as it is known, goes up to M Street behind  |
| 19 | this project. What would you suggest it's future be |
| 20 | in the way of zoning?                               |
| 21 | MR. DOBBINS: In the way of zoning?                  |
| 22 | MR. PARSONS: Mixed use or commercial?               |
| 23 | MR. DOBBINS: Certainly mixed use yes.               |
| 24 | I would support mixed use. I think we first of all  |
| 25 | mixed use generally means commercial and            |
| 26 | residential. Although in this case I think mixed    |

| 1  | use also means open space and institutional as it    |
|----|--|
| 2  | relates to what ECC is proposing. But as far as the  |
| 3  | Gateway is concerned I would see high density,       |
| 4  | predominately commercial development immediately     |
| 5  | around the Metrorail station as an anchor if you     |
| 6  | will. I would also see this project as an anchor     |
| 7  | bordering the Anacostia river, high density in       |
| 8  | nature as we are proposing. And then I would see     |
| 9  | residential, a mix of residential and commercial,    |
| 10 | sort of filling in between these two anchors with    |
| 11 | bonuses being offered to the commercial developers   |
| 12 | for providing the requisite residential with the     |
| 13 | shuttle service that we have proposed shuttling      |
| 14 | along that street increasing the viability of that   |
| 15 | street for retailing activity.                       |
| 16 | MR. PARSONS: How would you as a zoning               |
| 17 | commissioner if you will or from our side of the     |
| 18 | bench here, urge residential in an area where we, if |
| 19 | we approve this PUD and approve commercial at this   |
| 20 | end, had talked about and approved commercial at the |
| 21 | far end, how could we withstand pressure for people  |
| 22 | saying, just as you are telling us, the area isn't   |
| 23 | ripe for this, I have got an opportunity for the     |
| 24 | department of whatever who has got an RFP out and I  |
| 25 | am ready to go and if you care about this city, you  |
| 26 | will approve this? I guess I see with the approval   |

| 1  | of this PUD at this end as commercial, that there is |
|----|--|
| 2  | no hope for any mixed use from here to the Metro     |
| 3  | stop. I just cannot believe that we can sit here     |
| 4  | and with people coming forward and saying, "I have   |
| 5  | seen the light and I can build residential for you." |
| 6  | Maybe I have been sitting here to long, but I have   |
| 7  | heard argument after argument so I have heard your   |
| 8  | point and I guess you have heard my point.           |
| 9  | I guess the biggest concern is there are             |
| 10 | two tracks that are potential development areas on   |
| 11 | either side of the South Capitol Street bridge.      |
| 12 | This is one of them. Many us hope we would           |
| 13 | destination and festival retail and all of the kinds |
| 14 | of things are contained in the unapproved plan. So   |
| 15 | here we are taking one of those sites and saying we  |
| 16 | are not ready yet. How would you deal with the       |
| 17 | property to the south of South Capitol Street?       |
| 18 | If we are preforming a planning                      |
| 19 | commission function here tonight whether we like it  |
| 20 | or are authorized to do so or not                    |
| 21 | MR. DOBBINS: First of all I would                    |
| 22 | disagree that we are talking about a development     |
| 23 | here that will not bring life and activity and       |
| 24 | vitality to the waterfront area.                     |
| 25 | MR. PARSONS: Well, help me with that                 |
| 26 | MR. DOBBINS: You have used the term                  |

| 1  | festival retail for example. There is in my opinion  |
|----|--|
| 2  | considerable retail within the context of the        |
| 3  | proposed PUD, retail that has been referred to by    |
| 4  | Mr. Prost and others as destination retail. So I     |
| 5  | think that we certainly have the opportunity to      |
| 6  | create a festive retail environment and that the     |
| 7  | square footage that is being talked about and the    |
| 8  | kind of marketing that is being proposed for those   |
| 9  | retail properties are consistent with the objectives |
| 10 | that you have described.                             |
| 11 | The other part of that is programming as             |
| 12 | you know. The District really doesn't have a good    |
| 13 | reputation in programming its public spaces. But I   |
| 14 | hear from the developer and I also hear from the     |
| 15 | movers and shakers in the District of Columbia that  |
| 16 | is going to change as well. That we are going to do  |
| 17 | a better job of making use of our assets. And I      |
| 18 | quite frankly believe that is going happen because   |
| 19 | it absolutely has to happen.                         |
| 20 | So I would not agree that this project               |
| 21 | is totally devoid of what we are trying to achieve   |
| 22 | in terms of mix use and vitality on the waterfront.  |
| 23 | There is more than one way of having a livable       |
| 24 | downtown. I think we have all or a livable           |
| 25 | community. I think we all have consigned it as       |
| 26 | residential but it is not just residential.          |

| 1  | Livability is just living, it is liveliness as well. |
|----|--|
| 2  | So I would just offer that perspective as well.      |
| 3  | Now, your second question and your most              |
| 4  | important question had to do with how I would        |
| 5  | envision development south of where?                 |
| 6  | MR. PARSONS: Downstream of the bridge.               |
| 7  | MR. DOBBINS: Downstream of the bridge.               |
| 8  | Well, I still think as has already been said that    |
| 9  | mixed use is the appropriate objective for the       |
| 10 | entire area. I still believe, as I have said and     |
| 11 | others have said that it will be a project by        |
| 12 | project decision. I also still believe that if       |
| 13 | there were a project to come in the very near future |
| 14 | that was commercial in nature, that was commercial   |
| 15 | in nature, that would be a dilemma because I still   |
| 16 | don't believe that residential can happen in there   |
| 17 | until this project has had a chance to see its end.  |
| 18 | I think we are talking about a two year window as    |
| 19 | far as DOT is concerned. PUDs are normally approved  |
| 20 | on a two year cycle. I think you have a real         |
| 21 | opportunity to hear, to see what is going to happen  |
| 22 | at the end of two years. And you can make the        |
| 23 | adjustments that you need to make at the end of      |
| 24 | those two years. And even with that in this two      |
| 25 | year period I am sure that with the attention that   |
| 26 | this PUD has focused on that area and with other     |

| T   | accention that has been focused on that area that we |
|-----|--|
| 2   | will see a lot more study done in that area so that  |
| 3   | you will be more ably guided to making you decisions |
| 4   | in that area.  |
| 5   | MR. PARSONS: Thank you.                              |
| 6   | MR. FRANKLIN: Madame chair I believe                 |
| 7   | Mr. Dobbins point about time is very cogent because  |
| 8   | we are not sitting on a PUD application. We are not  |
| 9   | here necessarily what for all time will go on this   |
| 10  | site. It may very well be possible that after two    |
| 11  | years we will have to revisit the matter.            |
| 12  | MR. PARSONS: We will have made a                     |
| 13  | decision that for some reason, and I haven't come to |
| 14  | it yet, commercial is mixed use. That's the          |
| 15  | decision before us.                                  |
| 16  | MR. FRANKLIN: We are talking about                   |
| 17  | office, retail, and institutional, if you want to    |
| 18  | call it that, at the same time.                      |
| 19  | MR. DOBBINS: The PUD is more than what               |
| 20  | occurs on the Florida Rock property. The PUD needs   |
| 21  | to be viewed in its entirety. It is both the         |
| 22  | Florida Rock property and square 644E. Now nowhere   |
| 23  | on the comprehensive plan is there institutional.    |
| 24  | It says residential, commercial, and PTE, so are you |
| 25  | suggesting that the ECC proposal does not create a   |
| 2.6 | mixture of uses on that site or create the intent    |

| 1  | and objective of the comprehensive plan. I don't     |
|----|--|
| 2  | think you are and I certainly wouldn't.              |
| 3  | MR. PARSONS: I guess I might take                    |
| 4  | exception to that. I mean last time we met we had a  |
| 5  | hotel on this site. Residential is a stretch, but    |
| 6  | it was a hotel. It is gone, in favor of this other   |
| 7  | objective tonight. So not only have we lost that     |
| 8  | mixed use aspect of the project, we are into a whole |
| 9  | new debate here, discussion that whether this meets  |
| 10 | the goals of the plan.                               |
| 11 | MR. DOBBINS: Yes.                                    |
| 12 | MR. PARSONS: So that is very new                     |
| 13 | information tonight. Let me shift to Mr. Buckley.    |
| 14 | MR. BUCKLEY: Could I make one comment                |
| 15 | on that?   |
| 16 | MR. PARSONS: I am changing subjects                  |
| 17 | completely.  |
| 18 | MR. BUCKLEY: Go ahead.                               |
| 19 | MR. PARSONS: I have trouble with your                |
| 20 | study 11. I won't spend too much time on this        |
| 21 | because it is nitty-gritty and we want to get on     |
| 22 | with it. As I understand the diagram, it deals with  |
| 23 | bulkheads and property line. That property line is   |
| 24 | set back from the bulkhead line. Now I had hoped on  |
| 25 | this diagram that you would have, you let the Corps  |
| 26 | of Engineers cross a bulkhead line. My suspicion is  |

| 1  | it is your property line.                            |
|----|--|
| 2  | MR. BUCKLEY: No, actually the Corps of               |
| 3  | Engineers  |
| 4  | MR. STRIEGEL: The bulkhead line                      |
| 5  | identified on here is the Army Corps of Engineers    |
| 6  | bulkhead line.                                       |
| 7  | MR. BUCKLEY: That is the Corps of                    |
| 8  | Engineers Bulkhead line.                             |
| 9  | MR. PARSONS: On this diagram I am                    |
| 10 | looking at there is nothing labeled "bulkhead line." |
| 11 | MR. STRIEGEL: It is labeled bulkhead.                |
| 12 | MR. BUCKLEY: It says, "bulkhead."                    |
| 13 | MR. PARSONS: Correct. That is the                    |
| 14 | physical bulkhead that is in the water today.        |
| 15 | MR. STRIEGEL: The way the Army Corps of              |
| 16 | Engineers defines is there is some portions of       |
| 17 | existing bulkhead in place, other portions that have |
| 18 | been eroded and they require that you build a new    |
| 19 | bulkhead within 18 inches of the face of the         |
| 20 | existing bulkhead. And that is where we have shown   |
| 21 | this bulkhead line within 18 inches of the existing  |
| 22 | portions of the bulkhead. So we haven't created a    |
| 23 | new line. It is not the property line. The way the   |
| 24 | Army Corps of engineers defines                      |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Excuse me, let me               |
| 26 | interrupt you, could you please identify yourself    |

| 1   | for the record.                                     |
|-----|---|
| 2   | MR. STRIEGEL: Sure, my name is Tom                  |
| 3   | Striegel and I work with Davis Buckley Architects.  |
| 4   | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Thank you.                     |
| 5   | MR. STRIEGEL: The way the Army Corps of             |
| 6   | Engineers actually defines the property line has to |
| 7   | do with where the water is sitting that day. By     |
| 8   | their interpretation if the water went up ten feet, |
| 9   | they don't go by the designated meets and bounds    |
| L O | description of the property line. They would        |
| 1   | designate the property line as where the water      |
| _2  | actually is. So in terms of where to position a     |
| 13  | bulkhead, their requirement is that it is within 18 |
| _4  | inches of an existing bulkhead.                     |
| .5  | MR. PARSONS: Who owns the property                  |
| L6  | between, on your diagram, the property line and the |
| L7  | bulkhead? Is it possible it is the United States?   |
| 18  | MR. BUCKLEY: I can't answer that right              |
| _9  | now but we could get an answer for you.             |
| 20  | MR. PARSONS: That's what I was hoping               |
| 21  | we would get  |
| 22  | MR. BUCKLEY: I can                                  |
| 23  | MR. PARSONS: I think it is critical as              |
| 24  | to where we are measuring your building from.       |
| 25  | MR. STRIEGEL: The Army Corps has said               |
| 26  | that their jurisdiction ends at the bulkhead. Once  |

| 1  | a bulkhead is in place whatever happens behind it is |
|----|--|
| 2  | out their jurisdiction. I don't know if it is        |
| 3  | someone other than the Army Corps.                   |
| 4  | MR. PARSONS: Okay. Let's try to get a                |
| 5  | diagram that shows the property line, the bulkhead   |
| 6  | line, the bulkhead, and see if we can determine who  |
| 7  | owns between the bulkhead and the bulkhead line.     |
| 8  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Okay, give me that              |
| 9  | again. We need a diagram that shows the property     |
| 10 | line   |
| 11 | MR. PARSONS: That is on this one.                    |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Yes.                            |
| 13 | MR. PARSONS: The bulkhead, which is on               |
| 14 | this one.  |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Okay.                           |
| 16 | MR. PARSONS: And we are looking for                  |
| 17 | something the Corps of Engineers calls the bulkhead  |
| 18 | line, which is a demarcated line that they drew in   |
| 19 | 1899. And doesn't necessarily conform to what is     |
| 20 | out there on the ground.                             |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Is that what you                |
| 22 | want on the diagram, those three? You named          |
| 23 | something else.                                      |
| 24 | MR. PARSONS: Pardon me.                              |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: I thought you                   |
| 26 | named a fourth one.                                  |

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 (202) 234-4433

| 1  | MR. PARSONS: I didn't mean to I am                   |
|----|--|
| 2  | sorry. The fourth issue then is who owns the         |
| 3  | property between the bulkhead line and the property  |
| 4  | line. I think they are going to be the same, at      |
| 5  | least that is my experience. And then who owns the   |
| 6  | property then that is shown to be developed here.    |
| 7  | MR. BUCKLEY: We can certainly provide                |
| 8  | that.  |
| 9  | MR. PARSONS: And then we would presume               |
| 10 | that your building is measured from the property     |
| 11 | line in these diagrams, not the bulkhead line.       |
| 12 | MR. STRIEGEL: The diagram shows that                 |
| 13 | the set back, minimum set back of 50 feet at any     |
| 14 | portion is measured from the bulkhead line.          |
| 15 | MR. PARSONS: Bulkhead or bulkhead line.              |
| 16 | MR. STRIEGEL: From the bulkhead.                     |
| 17 | MR. PARSONS: That is what I am asking.               |
| 18 | MR. STRIEGEL: Because the Corps is                   |
| 19 | permitting that we build the bulkhead within 18      |
| 20 | inches of the existing bulkhead which was built      |
| 21 | sometime after 1894 and have already permitted. If   |
| 22 | you look at this diagram where you see the large     |
| 23 | pavilion in front of the east building, there is a   |
| 24 | bend at that portion. Everything from that area      |
| 25 | south, that 500 feet, the Army Corps has already     |
| 26 | approved and permitted a new bulkhead of 500 feet in |

| 1  | that position.                                       |
|----|--|
| 2  | The issue of bulkhead line never came up             |
| 3  | in the design or approval or permitting of that      |
| 4  | bulkhead, just the position of the existing          |
| 5  | bulkhead.  |
| 6  | MR. PARSONS: The main issue I am                     |
| 7  | getting to is let's make sure we are measuring your  |
| 8  | buildings from the right place and that you own the  |
| 9  | land you intend to improve.                          |
| 10 | I think holding this diagram if we could             |
| 11 | go to, the only one I have got handy is this booklet |
| 12 | with four diagrams in it, which maybe obsolete but I |
| 13 | think it will serve us. In these four diagrams it    |
| 14 | is a bit of a different configuration as it comes to |
| 15 | this end of the property.                            |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Where are you                   |
| 17 | looking at now.                                      |
| 18 | MR. PARSONS: I am looking at these four              |
| 19 | diagrams here, which are contained in their colorful |
| 20 | booklet of last time. And there may be some          |
| 21 | diagrams that  |
| 22 | MR. STRIEGEL: That page is also in the               |
| 23 | introduction of the big site book. It is the first   |
| 24 | page after the table of contents.                    |
| 25 | MR. PARSONS: All right fine. Now we                  |
| 26 | have to turn these upside down to better understand  |

| 1  | them, but it would appear from this diagram or maybe |
|----|--|
| 2  | it is schematic, I am not sure, that a major fill in |
| 3  | the river is proposed or something at this critical  |
| 4  | area. Is that proposed?                              |
| 5  | MR. STRIEGEL: No it is not proposed to               |
| 6  | fill in. Since you brought that up at the last       |
| 7  | hearing we did reach the lines, you know, that we    |
| 8  | talked about property line, looked at the            |
| 9  | configuration of the existing shoreline and have     |
| 10 | accurately reflected that in the variation 3A.       |
| 11 | MR. PARSONS: So the proposal is here.                |
| 12 | The boardwalk out to the pumphouse is as it is       |
| 13 | today?   |
| 14 | MR. STRIEGEL: Correct.                               |
| 15 | MR. PARSONS: As it is shown here?                    |
| 16 | MR. STRIEGEL: Correct.                               |
| 17 | MR. PARSONS: You are setting back from               |
| 18 | First Street and that would shorten the building on  |
| 19 | that end I guess. It needs to get much closer to     |
| 20 | First Street.  |
| 21 | MR. STRIEGEL: From that shoreline, we                |
| 22 | were looking at the portion of the shoreline that    |
| 23 | turns where the bend in the catwalk to the pumphouse |
| 24 | is and set off 50 feet from the waterfront there as  |
| 25 | well.  |
| 26 | MR. PARSONS: Now moving down to your                 |

| T  | quasipromenade at the center of the complex. That   |
|----|---|
| 2  | is open water now as I recall underneath those      |
| 3  | stairs that are shown. Do you have permit from the  |
| 4  | Corps of Engineers or any indication from them that |
| 5  | they would allow you to fill that area.             |
| 6  | MR. STRIEGEL: They have permitted a                 |
| 7  | bulkhead straight across from the portion that we   |
| 8  | are talking about, from the large pavilion all the  |
| 9  | way down to the pier of the bridge.                 |
| 10 | MR. PARSONS: Is that open water at the              |
| 11 | moment?   |
| 12 | MR. STRIEGEL: There is                              |
| 13 | MR. PARSONS: It seems to be on your                 |
| 14 | existing topography diagram that is else where in   |
| 15 | this study.   |
| 16 | MR. STRIEGEL: There are portions of                 |
| 17 | eroded waterfront. And basically the Army Corps of  |
| 18 | Engineers says that as long as we stay within 18    |
| 19 | inches of the remaining portions of bulkhead, that  |
| 20 | was permissible. So there is some to either side of |
| 21 | the eroded areas.                                   |
| 22 | MR. PARSONS: I am little confused. I                |
| 23 | am almost done here, those orange tabs don't let    |
| 24 | them scare you.                                     |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: That's why I left              |
| 26 | you to last.  |

| 1  | (Laughter.)  |
|----|--|
| 2  | MR. PARSONS: I am trying to find an                  |
| 3  | exhibit.   |
| 4  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: While you are                   |
| 5  | looking for that, you were saying that the Army      |
| 6  | Corps of Engineers already permitted a bulkhead that |
| 7  | would go from the large pavilion of the eastern most |
| 8  | building straight across the site?                   |
| 9  | MR. STRIEGEL: Straight southwest, do                 |
| 10 | you see where it ends at the pier of the bridge. A   |
| 11 | straight line, 500 feet run. They have already       |
| 12 | approved and permitted that as well as the District  |
| 13 | of Columbia has done the same.                       |
| 14 | MR. PARSONS: Okay. It would seem                     |
| 15 | helpful then if we could have a copy of the Corps    |
| 16 | of Engineers permit or whatever evidence you have    |
| 17 | got that says that.                                  |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: In lieu of the                  |
| 19 | diagrams you are asking?                             |
| 20 | MR. PARSONS: In addition to.                         |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: In addition to.                 |
| 22 | You still want to see the bulkhead line drawn in     |
| 23 | 1899.  |
| 24 | MR. PARSONS: It is my experience that                |
| 25 | they would not allow filling in the water even if    |
| 26 | there was a remnant of the bulkhead there.           |

| 1  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: So you want a                   |
|----|--|
| 2  | communication from the Army Corps of Engineers?      |
| 3  | MR. PARSONS: Yes.                                    |
| 4  | What I suspect you would find is that                |
| 5  | they would allow you to deck over that water. That   |
| 6  | was done at Washington Harbor, for instance, not to  |
| 7  | fill it in with those stairs that you have.          |
| 8  | That's all I have.                                   |
| 9  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Franklin.                   |
| 10 | MR. FRANKLIN: Mr. Buckley, first of all              |
| 11 | let me thank you for the responsiveness you have     |
| 12 | shown since the questions of the last hearing. I     |
| 13 | have found your studies quite interesting. I am      |
| 14 | sure you have profited as well by undertaking them.  |
| 15 | MR. BUCKLEY: Yes we did.                             |
| 16 | MR. FRANKLIN: The omission of the hotel              |
| 17 | is being driven by what?                             |
| 18 | MR. BUCKLEY: At the last Commission                  |
| 19 | meeting, Commissioner Kress asked us to look at      |
| 20 | lowering the height of the building by possibly the  |
| 21 | elimination of the hotel, which we did. The hotel    |
| 22 | represents approximately, and the discussion at that |
| 23 | time as I recall it was how much of the square       |
| 24 | footage is contained, how much square footage is     |
| 25 | contained in the hotel. And we said it is            |
| 26 | approximately a 1FAR. And that represents            |

| 1  | approximately two floors if you will on the          |
|----|--|
| 2  | building. So what we did was we lowered the          |
| 3  | building from a height of 130 feet down to a height  |
| 4  | of 109 feet, which represents two floors. And we     |
| 5  | did that by the elimination of the hotel.            |
| 6  | MR. FRANKLIN: Well, would it be fair to              |
| 7  | say in trying to get enough space for DOT meaning    |
| 8  | 1.5 million, that also played a role in omitting the |
| 9  | hotel?   |
| 10 | MR. BUCKLEY: Yes. With the hotel the                 |
| 11 | total amount of square footage on this site was      |
| 12 | 1,756,000 square feet. And what we did was we        |
| 13 | looked at several design issues. One, the moving     |
| 14 | back of the, if you will, the building from the      |
| 15 | waterfront closest to the bridge. We looked at       |
| 16 | curving the eastern most end of the building to the  |
| 17 | side. And we looked at lowering the floors of the    |
| 18 | building. And also setting the building back if you  |
| 19 | will from the property line where we took a look at  |
| 20 | the actual alignment of the bulkhead. We had always  |
| 21 | had envisioned that it would go straight across.     |
| 22 | But we said, "well it there , it may always remain   |
| 23 | there." While we would prefer to have a direct       |
| 24 | connection to the pumphouse we reflected exactly     |
| 25 | what the existing conditions were and we set that    |
| 26 | portion of the building back 50 feet from that       |

| 1  | portion of the site.                                 |
|----|--|
| 2  | So there are a variety of things. One                |
| 3  | is in response to Mr. Parsons' concern about the     |
| 4  | vista down Half Street and moving the building back. |
| 5  | Two, Commissioner Kress's request, which we thought  |
| 6  | was an excellent suggestion of opening the vista as  |
| 7  | you go into the courtyard to really get the view up  |
| 8  | river, which we think is the significant view. And   |
| 9  | the third thing is to lower the building by as much  |
| 10 | as two stories, which we did. Not only did we lower  |
| 11 | it two stories on the eastern most building, but we  |
| 12 | also opened up that vista through to create two      |
| 13 | buildings. And the majority of the visual aspect to  |
| 14 | the building closed to the bridge is 109 feet and we |
| 15 | only have that one portion which is the curvilinear  |
| 16 | top two floors that are set back in order to meet    |
| 17 | the space requirement.                               |
| 18 | And we moved certain elements out where              |
| 19 | we could do it closest to the bridge, which we       |
| 20 | thought was a reasonable response. So we did that    |
| 21 | within the context of those urban design             |
| 22 | suggestions.   |
| 23 | MR. FRANKLIN: Where I am leading is                  |
| 24 | suppose you don't get the DOT award here. And you    |
| 25 | have got two buildings of roughly 750,000. What      |
| 26 | possibilities would that present for reintroducing   |

| 1  | hotel uses to the site. That's really a market       |
|----|--|
| 2  | question at this point/                              |
| 3  | MR. FRANKLIN: Yes, I grant you it is a               |
| 4  | market question at this point.                       |
| 5  | MR. BUCKLEY: Dick Haase might be able                |
| 6  | to answer that.                                      |
| 7  | MR. HAASE: Let me may I address it                   |
| 8  | in this way. There are two significant sites in      |
| 9  | this city, Washington Harbor and the portal site.    |
| 10 | Both of them have been programmed for hotels that    |
| 11 | have never came to place because they weren't as Mr. |
| 12 | Buckley said not financially feasible in the         |
| 13 | appraisal.   |
| 14 | MR. FRANKLIN: And why in your view were              |
| 15 | they not at those sites?                             |
| 16 | MR. HAASE: Well just because of the                  |
| 17 | people who build hotels and operate hotels thought   |
| 18 | that there was not going to be enough of a market in |
| 19 | those particular areas and I defy anybody to take    |
| 20 | any exception with either one of those sites which   |
| 21 | are infinitely better I would say than this          |
| 22 | particular site.                                     |
| 23 | MR. FRANKLIN: Not withstanding the Navy              |
| 24 | Yard and   |
| 25 | MR. HAASE: Not withstanding the Navy                 |
| 26 | Yard and all that. The Georgetown hotel operates at  |

| 1  | an 85 percent efficiency or occupancy. You would     |
|----|--|
| 2  | certainly think a block away from the Georgetown     |
| 3  | hotel that you could build a hotel and at least      |
| 4  | expect something reasonable in the 70 percent and    |
| 5  | that site will not be developed. And it had three    |
| 6  | different potential developers look at for a hotel   |
| 7  | site.  |
| 8  | MR. PROST: I guess what I would like to              |
| 9  | add, I think it really relates to the dynamics of    |
| 10 | the particular site.                                 |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Could you identify              |
| 12 | yourself?  |
| 13 | MR. PROST: I am sorry. Jim Prost.                    |
| 14 | It really relates to the dynamics of the             |
| 15 | site. If there is a single building in a relatively  |
| 16 | small then the idea of a hotel would premature. If   |
| 17 | it was another development in combination with what  |
| 18 | happens at the Navy Yard and the Southwest Federal   |
| 19 | Center in terms of its developments then there       |
| 20 | becomes an opportunity. The marketability of a       |
| 21 | hotel is all over, the occupancy rates are up, the   |
| 22 | rates are up, so the market opportunities are        |
| 23 | getting better. Again it is a response to the        |
| 24 | market. Once again there are some competitive        |
| 25 | advantages in terms of the new tax law which creates |
| 26 | a minor window for the five year period that the tax |

| 1  | law is in effect because again the hotel employees   |
|----|--|
| 2  | would be subject to the tax credits if they were     |
| 3  | also District residents. The site is also subject    |
| 4  | to the capital gains, zero capital gains tax aspect  |
| 5  | of the new tax bill. Although some of the details    |
| 6  | of that maybe problematical in terms in trying to    |
| 7  | take advantage of it. There may be a technical       |
| 8  | correction bill that would clarify some of those     |
| 9  | issues.  |
| 10 | But the site has some advantages not                 |
| 11 | just from a public sector site but from a private    |
| 12 | sector site, particularly when you add the new tax   |
| 13 | bill.  |
| 14 | MR. FRANKLIN: Of course for the capital              |
| 15 | gains benefit to be meaningful you have to assume    |
| 16 | that there will be a capital gain.                   |
| 17 | MR. PROST: You have to hold it for five              |
| 18 | years and there are all kinds of rules.              |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Parsons.                    |
| 20 | MR. PARSONS: I have another question.                |
| 21 | I don't know if Mr. Nixon or Mr. Anderson or all of  |
| 22 | you. I wanted to talk a bit about square 664 east.   |
| 23 | The last diagram we had had a housing component at   |
| 24 | its western edge, a diagrammatic memorial within it. |
| 25 | As I recall Mr. Nixon was going to be not Mr.        |
| 26 | Nixon but the ECC was going to be accommodated on    |

| 1  | the ground floor of that building, or in a separate  |
|----|--|
| 2  | building on the site. As I understand it tonight     |
| 3  | Mr. Anderson has committed to giving you one half of |
| 4  | the site now and one half of the site ten years from |
| 5  | now as you testified. How then will we know what     |
| 6  | this going to look like as opposed to the diagram    |
| 7  | which was produced last time which gave us some      |
| 8  | sense of the place.                                  |
| 9  | MR. NIXON: I am Bob Nixon, executive                 |
| 10 | director of the ECC. The first stage we are talking  |
| 11 | about, the phase 1 half of the lot would be          |
| 12 | primarily the water side portion. And that would be  |
| 13 | phase 1 where we institute a number of the programs  |
| 14 | that Mr. Davis outlined initially. The second phase  |
| 15 | will be when we build out in the back portion which  |
| 16 | was the diagram I believe you have which shows the   |
| 17 | larger classrooms in the back section that would be  |
| 18 | after the tenth year, where we would be meeting full |
| 19 | capacity. So the initial sailing programs, boat      |
| 20 | restoration, we would enact very quickly. And build  |
| 21 | several sites over the next three years, which would |
| 22 | be permanent. I guess to answer you question, we     |
| 23 | would look at it as a whole site, a campus           |
| 24 | environment and we would be building phase 1 on the  |
| 25 | water side section.                                  |
| 26 | MR. DAVIS: My name is Mark Davis, the                |

| 1  | CEO of the ECC. I believe Commissioner Parsons if    |
|----|--|
| 2  | you look at that particular diagram that the         |
| 3  | building in the back part of that lot is not a 1FAR  |
| 4  | housing platform, but that is the ECC maritime       |
| 5  | center building, that is the primary educational     |
| 6  | facility that would house our laboratories and       |
| 7  | classrooms.  |
| 8  | MR. PARSONS: Okay then, this site plan.              |
| 9  | MR. DAVIS: That is still a valid plan                |
| 10 | in our mind at this time. We don't have a direct     |
| 11 | conception of what the building would look like but  |
| 12 | that is still a valid plan.                          |
| 13 | MR. PARSONS: It is hard to identify                  |
| 14 | this because it has no number on it and some of my   |
| 15 | colleagues didn't bring their stuff from last time.  |
| 16 | You must hundreds of them out there. Anyway, the     |
| 17 | diagram I am speaking of is horizontal and this      |
| 18 | says, "site plan: square 664 east."                  |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Is that the same                |
| 20 | as this.   |
| 21 | (Pause.)   |
| 22 | MR. DAVIS: Yes sir. As I mentioned in                |
| 23 | the diagrams you held up I was pretty sure that this |
| 24 | was the one that we were initially looking at. And   |
| 25 | our concept is on the Water Street side              |
| 26 | MR. NIXON: It is on this, several pages              |

| 1   | back.  |
|-----|--|
| 2   | (Pause.)   |
| 3   | MR. PARSONS: Okay so the first diagram               |
| 4   | shows the hotel or residential.                      |
| 5   | MR. NIXON: Right.                                    |
| 6   | MR. PARSONS: This diagram shows your                 |
| 7   | (Pause.)   |
| 8   | MR. PARSONS: I guess I am it is                      |
| 9   | pretty immature to pin down your site plan. That's   |
| 10  | not what I am about tonight, but I think we all know |
| 11  | the terminus of South Capitol Street, with your      |
| 12  | presence going to be very important. And Mr.         |
| 13  | Buckley had sketched a diagram of some kind of       |
| 14  | feature. They are showing a blue, maybe a pool,      |
| 15  | some kind of focal point at the terminus of South    |
| 16  | Capitol Street. How would we see that achieved       |
| 17  | under your plan? Would you give that land to the     |
| 18  | city and have them develop such a feature?           |
| 19  | Certainly it wouldn't be in your program to erect a  |
| 20  | memorial or monument there.                          |
| 21  | MR. BUCKLEY: Perhaps I could take you                |
| 22  | through this program a little. In order for us to    |
| 23  | understand more clearly what the ECC envisions, what |
| 24  | we are interested in was to take a look at the kind  |
| 25  | of urban dynamics of the site in the context of what |
| 2.6 | I think all those things that we would like to see   |

| 1  | and recognizing the importance of not only of the    |
|----|--|
| 2  | ECC but also the importance of this vista down South |
| 3  | Capitol Street. And I think this is what you are     |
| 4  | referring to. This is a strategically very           |
| 5  | important site in terms of the long range vision of  |
| 6  | the city. It is in fact the terminus of South        |
| 7  | Capitol Street.                                      |
| 8  | Without going into the height                        |
| 9  | differential as you go down South Capitol Street and |
| 10 | the impact of the Douglas Bridge as it swings off up |
| 11 | river, there is no doubt in anybody's mind that this |
| 12 | area is extremely important now in developing the    |
| 13 | plan with the ECC, what we did was we looked at      |
| 14 | basically two phases of development. The first       |
| 15 | phase would be located on this part of the site.     |
| 16 | And if you refer to the maritime education center,   |
| 17 | you will see it is referred to as a campus plan.     |
| 18 | Now this preliminary in nature and of course it      |
| 19 | evolve over time as they become more specific with   |
| 20 | their facility needs. Now having said that it is A)  |
| 21 | that there will be a boat restoration shop building  |
| 22 | and railway for the restoration of boats located in  |
| 23 | close proximity to the water. We would envision      |
| 24 | that that rail facility would be located somewhere   |
| 25 | over here. In addition to that that they would have  |
| 26 | administrative offices in that area.                 |

| 1  | The second phase of their development                |
|----|--|
| 2  | would be the primary maritime education center which |
| 3  | would be a classroom type facility of about 67,000   |
| 4  | square feet. We would envision that that would be    |
| 5  | located over here.                                   |
| 6  | MR. PARSONS: That would be one story,                |
| 7  | no air rights left over just                         |
| 8  | MR. BUCKLEY: No, I don't think it would              |
| 9  | be one story. It might be two.                       |
| 10 | MR. PARSONS: But not 14 stories.                     |
| 11 | MR. BUCKLEY: It could be 14, but                     |
| 12 | MR. PARSONS: A big difference isn't it?              |
| 13 | MR. BUCKLEY: It would be approximately               |
| 14 | 3 1/2 stories essentially. The actual storage boat   |
| 15 | facility in fact would be very tall because it would |
| 16 | have to accommodate sailing vessels in this area so  |
| 17 | that actual facility may be as high as 60 feet if    |
| 18 | you wanted to accommodate the fullest portion of a   |
| 19 | mast, for instance, if you had some kind of a        |
| 20 | skipjack which is a typical Chesapeake Bay type      |
| 21 | boat.  |
| 22 | With that in mind, what we have talked               |
| 23 | to the ECC about is the importance of having this    |
| 24 | visual corridor down South Capitol Street, so that   |
| 25 | you may in the future have that area as na open      |
| 26 | area. That doesn't necessarily mean or preclude the  |

| 1  | usage of the site through here. But it would         |
|----|--|
| 2  | probably preclude the building of buildings in that  |
| 3  | area, oftentimes referred to as a no building zone   |
| 4  | if you will. What we think is important is the       |
| 5  | opportunity to develop a monument or marker here     |
| 6  | which could be built in the future to help define    |
| 7  | the terminus of South Capitol Street. That in fact   |
| 8  | could be part of the overall campus plan of the ECC. |
| 9  | So I think we recognize the value of the vista down  |
| 10 | South Capitol Street and perhaps the importance of   |
| 11 | keeping that open.                                   |
| 12 | But I think that also has to balanced                |
| 13 | with the facility needs of the ECC, which suggests   |
| 14 | that you have a portion of development on this side  |
| 15 | and the main classroom facility on this side, which  |
| 16 | would also give you good access off of Water Street. |
| 17 | MR. PARSONS: Thank you, that is                      |
| 18 | helpful.   |
| 19 | Mr. Anderson, why is it you are waiting              |
| 20 | ten years to make the                                |
| 21 | MR. ANDERSON: My name is John Anderson,              |
| 22 | president of Florida Rock Properties. What we plan   |
| 23 | to do is phase our existing industrial or really the |
| 24 | operations on our industrial tenant, they are ready  |
| 25 | mix concrete, sand, and gravel, although on the      |
| 26 | large PUD site as construction commences, for        |

| 1  | example, for the DOT, we hope that they would be     |
|----|--|
| 2  | pre-empted from the site, they will transition down. |
| 3  | This site, square is already industrial, it is       |
| 4  | already aggregate business usage anyway. What we     |
| 5  | have agreed to with Bob Nixon is to essentially      |
| 6  | reserve half of that as yet an undefined, undivided  |
| 7  | half of that square for continued aggregate          |
| 8  | industrial use for a period of roughly ten years.    |
| 9  | At the end of that phase that out and deed that over |
| 10 | to the ECC.  |
| 11 | MR. PARSONS: So you would deed the                   |
| 12 | title with no rights, air rights development or      |
| 13 | anything else, they would be the owners of this      |
| 14 | property?  |
| 15 | MR. ANDERSON: It is our intent to give               |
| 16 | them fee simple interest, half now, half in ten      |
| 17 | years.   |
| 18 | MR. PARSONS: In our clumsy process, I                |
| 19 | shouldn't identify it as clumsy, cumbersome process, |
| 20 | I didn't mean clumsy at all.                         |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Challenging.                    |
| 22 | (Laughter.)  |
| 23 | MR. PARSONS: Any time Mr. Nixon wanted               |
| 24 | to do anything                                       |
| 25 | MR. ANDERSON: You will pardon me if I                |
| 26 | agree with both of you.                              |

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 (202) 234-4433

| 1  | MR. PARSONS: His successors would have               |
|----|--|
| 2  | to come back here to modify the PUD is the way this  |
| 3  | is going.  |
| 4  | MS. GIARDANO: Maybe I can help with                  |
| 5  | that. The idea is that while this is a two stage     |
| 6  | PUD, in the second phase we would be further along   |
| 7  | in our planning for that site. So hopefully we will  |
| 8  | plan with some flexibility so that won't be          |
| 9  | necessary.   |
| 10 | MR. PARSONS: I think that we would do                |
| 11 | it together. The point is, for instance, if Mr.      |
| 12 | Anderson was to donate this land to the District of  |
| 13 | Columbia and made it public land rather than private |
| 14 | property there would be no reason to come back to    |
| 15 | the Zoning Commission any time a change was made.    |
| 16 | It would go through a different review process. But  |
| 17 | this would ride with the PUD in perpetuity.          |
| 18 | MS. GIARDANO: Exactly. This would have               |
| 19 | a PUD covenant recorded on it and it would be        |
| 20 | subject to the PUD process.                          |
| 21 | MR. PARSONS: Thank you.                              |
| 22 | MR. FRANKLIN: The boat restoration                   |
| 23 | business is I guess light industrial is that what    |
| 24 | you would call it.                                   |
| 25 | MR. PARSONS: It's mixed use.                         |
| 26 | (Laughter.)  |

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 (202) 234-4433

| 1  | MR. BUCKLEY: Well in many ways it is                 |
|----|--|
| 2  | not dissimilar from what you would see on the video  |
| 3  | or perhaps what you would see if you went to say,    |
| 4  | Mystic Seaport or the Gardener School of Boat        |
| 5  | Building in Maine for instance or in Annapolis.      |
| 6  | MR. FRANKLIN: It requires machinery and              |
| 7  | there is material and noise and you know the view of |
| 8  | working and  |
| 9  | MR. DAVIS: It is an educational                      |
| 10 | facility. It is almost identical to an industrial    |
| 11 | arts shop in any typical high school.                |
| 12 | MR. FRANKLIN: I don't mean to denigrate              |
| 13 | it. I find those fascinating.                        |
| 14 | Mr. Anderson could you tell us a little              |
| 15 | bit about the financing that is being proposed       |
| 16 | assuming you get the DOT award and then assuming you |
| 17 | don't. We get PUDs all the time and nothing happens  |
| 18 | and then people come back in two and say they can't  |
| 19 | get financing. And they come back two years later    |
| 20 | and say they still can't get financing. What is      |
| 21 | your financing programming.                          |
| 22 | MR. ANDERSON: Well those who can't get               |
| 23 | financing must not have a tenant. As you well know   |
| 24 | it would be our expectation here with long term      |
| 25 | credit federal tenant, that certainly serves as a    |
| 26 | basis for your long term permanent financing. So we  |

| 1  | are not and I hope I am not proven wrong later      |
|----|---|
| 2  | about this but we are not as concerned about that   |
| 3  | phase right now. We are quite interested in the     |
| 4  | competitive site selection for this. The financing  |
| 5  | for the use we envision and target, I would be      |
| 6  | surprised if other applicants say they have trouble |
| 7  | in the financing phase with that.                   |
| 8  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Okay does that                 |
| 9  | wrap up the question side. Okay. Well thank you     |
| 10 | very much. I am going call for a five minute break. |
| 11 | I do have a note here from a Mrs. Ransom, is Mrs.   |
| 12 | Ransom still here? All right. We are going to do a  |
| 13 | five minute break.                                  |
| 14 | (Whereupon, the proceedings in the                  |
| 15 | above-entitled matter went off the record at 9:29   |
| 16 | p.m. and went back on the record at 9:37 p.m.)      |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: We are going to                |
| 18 | resume at this time and we are going to ask the     |
| 19 | parties in the case whether or not they had cross   |
| 20 | examination for the applicant's witnesses. To the   |
| 21 | refresh you memories, the parties that I have       |
| 22 | registered here are only ANC 6B and ANC 2D, is that |
| 23 | correct Ms. Dobbins?                                |
| 24 | MS. DOBBINS: That is correct.                       |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Is the                         |
| 26 | representative from ANC 6B here and do you wish to  |

| 1  | cross examine.                                       |
|----|--|
| 2  | MR. SIMON: Madame Chairperson yes. We                |
| 3  | have a representative, Mr. Waldron is from 6B and    |
| 4  | Mr. Westbrook is from 2D and as usual I am           |
| 5  | ambidextrous.  |
| 6  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: All right. We are               |
| 7  | not sitting down for presentations right now, we are |
| 8  | asking for cross examination.                        |
| 9  | MR. SIMON: Also let me ask now, I                    |
| 10 | didn't want to interrupt the flow earlier and it has |
| 11 | been a while since I have been at contested          |
| 12 | hearings, but do we have copies of the material that |
| 13 | the applicant produced during the course of          |
| 14 | tonight's hearing?                                   |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: There is no                     |
| 16 | question that as parties you are entitled to         |
| 17 | MR. SIMON: Also we didn't express any                |
| 18 | opposition earlier to the motion to receive the      |
| 19 | waiver of the less than 14 days. We didn't object,   |
| 20 | but of course, we aren't waiving any rights to       |
| 21 | object later on should that become necessary.        |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Can the applicant               |
| 23 | make sure that the parties receive everything we     |
| 24 | receive.   |
| 25 | Questions.   |
| 26 | MR. SIMON: Could we ask Mr. Dobbins to               |

| 1  | come up?   |
|----|--|
| 2  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Please state your               |
| 3  | name and who you represent.                          |
| 4  | MR. SIMON: My name is Gottlieb Simon, I              |
| 5  | am executive director for Advisory Neighborhood      |
| 6  | Commission 6B and Advisory Neighborhood Commission   |
| 7  | 2D. Mr. Dobbins it is good to see you again.         |
| 8  | I wanted to follow up on a couple of points that the |
| 9  | chair made earlier on about situation also let me    |
| 10 | ask if this makes any difference in the microphone.  |
| 11 | Apparently not there is a switch that would seem to  |
| 12 | suggest that it would increase the volume but I      |
| 13 | guess not.   |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Simon when                  |
| 15 | your microphone is not on that turns the speaker on  |
| 16 | at that specific microphone up and down.             |
| 17 | MR. SIMON: I see, thank you very much.               |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: You are executive               |
| 19 | director for 6B and 2D?                              |
| 20 | MR. SIMON: Yes ma'am. And all together               |
| 21 | I don't have a full time job so that is no           |
| 22 | assurance.   |
| 23 | (Laughter.)  |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: I hear you.                     |
| 25 | MR. SIMON: Following up on the Chair's               |
| 26 | question from before, would it still achieve in your |

| 1  | view consistency with the comprehensive plan if all |
|----|---|
| 2  | of the area between the water front and M Street,   |
| 3  | between South Capitol and the Southeast Federal     |
| 4  | Center was all office use, but the employment and   |
| 5  | other aspects of the comprehensive plan were        |
| 6  | achieved?   |
| 7  | MR. DOBBINS: Between the water front, M             |
| 8  | Street, South Capitol Street, and the Southeast     |
| 9  | Federal Center? What if it were all commercial?     |
| 10 | MR. SIMON: Correct. In other words if               |
| 11 | all of the projects were like the project proposed  |
| 12 | tonight, but instead of stopping at Potomac Avenue, |
| 13 | it extended all the way up to M Street. And I am    |
| 14 | talking basically about more office                 |
| 15 | MR. DOBBINS: I wouldn't consider that               |
| 16 | mixed use.  |
| 17 | MR. SIMON: No, I didn't say mixed use.              |
| 18 | And my question may have been imperfect. What I was |
| 19 | trying to say was in your judgement about achieving |
| 20 | consistency with the comprehensive plan could you   |
| 21 | achieve consistency or the lack of inconsistency if |
| 22 | the buildings that were built there provided jobs   |
| 23 | and the other benefits that you cited as being part |
| 24 | of the comprehensive plan?                          |
| 25 | MR. DOBBINS: Well I think you can                   |
| 26 | achieve consistency with some aspects of the        |

| 1  | comprehensive plan as I mentioned there are many     |
|----|--|
| 2  | elements to the plan. I think you would be hard      |
| 3  | pressed to argue that you are not inconsistent with  |
| 4  | the land use element if all of that area were in     |
| 5  | commercial use.                                      |
| 6  | MR. SIMON: So at some point there would              |
| 7  | need to be some                                      |
| 8  | MR. DOBBINS: Yes, but at some point                  |
| 9  | there is a tipping point.                            |
| 10 | MR. SIMON: Let me ask you about the                  |
| 11 | issue of jobs. You pointed out that by providing     |
| 12 | employment on that site it would be achieving one of |
| 13 | the comprehensive plans                              |
| 14 | MR. DOBBINS: That is correct.                        |
| 15 | MR. SIMON: If this site and we have                  |
| 16 | been talking a great deal tonight about the          |
| 17 | department of transportation moving from Southwest   |
| 18 | to this site. If then we were talking about removing |
| 19 | jobs from Ward 2 and bringing jobs to Ward 6, would  |
| 20 | we still be consistent with the comprehensive plan?  |
| 21 | MR. DOBBINS: Well the employment                     |
| 22 | consistency had to do with the fact that Capital     |
| 23 | Gateway area and the Buzzard Point area is in the    |
| 24 | Buzzard Point/Capital Gateway Development            |
| 25 | Opportunity Area. In fact it is called the           |
| 26 | Metrorail Development Opportunity Area. And it also  |

| 1  | nas to do with the fact that the site is within the  |
|----|--|
| 2  | Central Employment Area. Now I don't believe that    |
| 3  | the current location of DOT is in the Central        |
| 4  | Employment Area. I may stand to be corrected the     |
| 5  | Office of Planning or someone else but I don't       |
| 6  | believe it is.                                       |
| 7  | And so the consistency has to do with                |
| 8  | the fact that the PUD site is within the Central     |
| 9  | Employment Area which is the area that is to have    |
| 10 | the most employment in the central core of the city  |
| 11 | as defined in the comprehensive plan.                |
| 12 | MR. SIMON: So let me use your your                   |
| 13 | testimony is that even though we would basically be  |
| 14 | shuffling jobs from one side of South Capitol Street |
| 15 | to the other side of South Capitol Street, you would |
| 16 | still  |
| 17 | MR. DOBBINS: I think you are more                    |
| 18 | consistent with the comprehensive plan given that    |
| 19 | you are in the CEA on the east side of South Capitol |
| 20 | Street.  |
| 21 | MR. SIMON: All right. In your view is                |
| 22 | there any difference between referring to an area as |
| 23 | being high density and being medium to high density? |
| 24 | MR. DOBBINS: Yes there is a difference.              |
| 25 | One implies a range from medium to high and the      |
| 26 | other is explicitly high.                            |

| 1  | MR. SIMON: And would you characterize               |
|----|---|
| 2  | the PUD as it is now being presented as medium to   |
| 3  | high?   |
| 4  | MR. DOBBINS: Yes I would.                           |
| 5  | MR. SIMON: Thank you.                               |
| 6  | MR. WESTBROOK: I have a question to ask             |
| 7  | Mr. Dobbins about.                                  |
| 8  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Could you identify             |
| 9  | yourself for the record?                            |
| 10 | MR. WESTBROOK: Yes, I am Richard B.                 |
| 11 | Westbrook ANC 2D commissioner. Let me ask the       |
| 12 | question of in your knowledge and background with   |
| 13 | the Office of Planning, was there ever any studies  |
| 14 | undertaken to determine what is happening to our    |
| 15 | industrial areas of this cities, are they being     |
| 16 | pushed out economically or just by citizen protests |
| 17 | such as around Fort Totten? And what is the future  |
| 18 | of industrial uses in the District of Columbia?     |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: These are the                  |
| 20 | questions I have been asking for at least the last  |
| 21 | ten years.  |
| 22 | MR. DOBBINS: And probably every month               |
| 23 | of my tenure  |
| 24 | (Laughter.)   |
| 25 | MR. DOBBINS: I managed to come up with              |
| 26 | an excuse every time it was asked.                  |

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 (202) 234-4433

| 1  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: This time you are              |
|----|---|
| 2  | under oath, Mr. Dobbins. You were under oath when   |
| 3  | you were sitting up here.                           |
| 4  | (Laughter.)   |
| 5  | MR. DOBBINS: I know of no study that                |
| 6  | has been done. I know the Office of Planning has    |
| 7  | fully documented the decline of industrial space,   |
| 8  | but not the reasons why that decline has taken      |
| 9  | place. There is a lot of anecdotal information that |
| 10 | would support and explain why industrial uses have  |
| 11 | declined in almost every major city in the country. |
| 12 | MR. WESTBROOK: I would also like to                 |
| 13 | submit for the record a copy of the Central         |
| 14 | Employment Area which DOT is in. And as this map    |
| 15 | indicates the Central Employment Area when you go   |
| 16 | across the Anacostia river and it is still the      |
| 17 | Central Employment Area.                            |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Well are you                   |
| 19 | asking a question now, Mr. Westbrook?               |
| 20 | MR. WESTBROOK: Well, how did that                   |
| 21 | happen Mr. Dobbins?                                 |
| 22 | MR. DOBBINS: It happened by an act of               |
| 23 | Council.  |
| 24 | MR. WESTBROOK: Was that reviewed by                 |
| 25 | NCPC?   |
| 26 | MR. DOBBINS: Yes, and by NCPC review.               |

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 (202) 234-4433 (202) 234-4433

| 1  | MR. WESTBROOK: I would like the record               |
|----|--|
| 2  | to note that I had retired before that issue had     |
| 3  | come up. Thank you. That's all I have.               |
| 4  | MR. WALDRON: Hello, I am Peter Waldron,              |
| 5  | can you hear me?                                     |
| 6  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Yes.                            |
| 7  | MR. WALDRON: I am Peter Waldron,                     |
| 8  | Commissioner from 6B-01, and I have two questions    |
| 9  | for Mr. Dobbins. You said earlier that even though   |
| 10 | this plan seems to have no residential component,    |
| 11 | you said that the plan will bring high density       |
| 12 | residential development that it has lacked. Could    |
| 13 | you tell us the basis for that?                      |
| 14 | MR. DOBBINS: Because I believe it will               |
| 15 | create an environment for residential development to |
| 16 | occur. It would bring people to the area. It will    |
| 17 | increase the areas sense of security. It will bring  |
| 18 | liveliness to the area. It will make the area more   |
| 19 | attractive to investment, and by doing so it will    |
| 20 | make residential developments much more likely.      |
| 21 | MR. WALDRON: And it is just your belief              |
| 22 | though, right?                                       |
| 23 | MR. DOBBINS: That is my belief.                      |
| 24 | MR. WALDRON: And the other statement                 |
| 25 | you made, it was kind of confusing, hopefully you    |
| 26 | can illuminate me. You said mixed use is best when   |

| 1  | livability doesn't mean people have to live there.   |
|----|--|
| 2  | MR. DOBBINS: Okay, yes, I might have                 |
| 3  | gotten my words mixed up there.                      |
| 4  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: He said that there              |
| 5  | are many more ways to make an area livable, it is    |
| 6  | not just where the location of residential use is,   |
| 7  | it is the bringing of liveliness, which can happen   |
| 8  | with or without the location of explicit residential |
| 9  | uses. I like.  |
| 10 | MR. DOBBINS: That's what I said.                     |
| 11 | (Laughter.)  |
| 12 | MR. WALDRON: Thank you Mr. Dobbins.                  |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Anytime, anytime.               |
| 14 | MR. SIMON: Thank you Peter.                          |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Do you have                     |
| 16 | questions of other witnesses?                        |
| 17 | MR. SIMON: Yes, someone representing                 |
| 18 | the transportation study.                            |
| 19 | MR.LERNER: My name is Abraham Lerner.                |
| 20 | MR. SIMON: How do you do Mr. Lerner.                 |
| 21 | Should I identify myself each time I ask a question? |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Yes.                            |
| 23 | MR. SIMON: All right, Gottlieb Simon.                |
| 24 | Mr. Lerner, your study indicates that South Capitol  |
| 25 | and M, and South Capitol and I, operate at congested |
| 26 | levels at the present time.                          |

| 1  | MR.LERNER: That is correct.                          |
|----|--|
| 2  | MR. SIMON: And that is a level F?                    |
| 3  | MR.LERNER: That is correct.                          |
| 4  | MR. SIMON: And in your field there is                |
| 5  | no level below F?                                    |
| 6  | MR.LERNER: No there is not.                          |
| 7  | MR. SIMON: But does F mean that traffic              |
| 8  | has come to a complete and total stop?               |
| 9  | MR.LERNER: F represents a level of                   |
| 10 | indicates that when we are at light at an            |
| 11 | intersection the wait is greater than 60 seconds per |
| 12 | vehicle.   |
| 13 | MR. SIMON: So although something is at               |
| 14 | level F, you can actually get worse even though you  |
| 15 | don't have a letter to describe that?                |
| 16 | MR.LERNER: That is correct.                          |
| 17 | MR. SIMON: So in the case of the                     |
| 18 | project that we are talking about tonight, you       |
| 19 | indicate that it will not change it from being level |
| 20 | F?   |
| 21 | MR.LERNER: With the proposed                         |
| 22 | improvement the intersections are not expected to    |
| 23 | work at levels which are considerably worse than the |
| 24 | existing conditions.                                 |
| 25 | MR. SIMON: Am correct in understanding               |
| 26 | that the project will not improve the traffic in     |

| 1  | those locations?                                     |
|----|--|
| 2  | MR.LERNER: The project, the building of              |
| 3  | the proposed building would not improve traffic      |
| 4  | conditions at those intersections.                   |
| 5  | MR. SIMON: Your study says, and I will               |
| 6  | use layman terms and you can correct me if I get it  |
| 7  | off or something, but it's already bad, it's going   |
| 8  | to stay bad and this won't make it any better. Is    |
| 9  | that a correct summarization?                        |
| 10 | MR.LERNER: The study proposed a number               |
| 11 | of improvements to make the intersections which are  |
| 12 | currently operating at congested levels, urban       |
| 13 | congested levels, it will make those intersections   |
| 14 | work in a manner which is very similar to the        |
| 15 | existing conditions.                                 |
| 16 | MR. SIMON: You also speak of the                     |
| 17 | shuttle service, is that correct?                    |
| 18 | MR.LERNER: That is correct.                          |
| 19 | MR. SIMON: Do you know who will pay for              |
| 20 | the shuttle service?                                 |
| 21 | MR.LERNER: It is our understanding,                  |
| 22 | being the transportation engineers who are doing the |
| 23 | analysis, it is the understanding that for a number  |
| 24 | of years that the shuttle service will be paid for   |
| 25 | and provided by the developer. Once again that is    |
| 26 | my understanding from being the transportation       |

| 1  | engineer on this project.                            |
|----|--|
| 2  | MR. SIMON: I appreciate that, thank you              |
| 3  | very much.   |
| 4  | MR. WESTBROOK: I have one question.                  |
| 5  | Was there an analysis                                |
| 6  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Westbrook.                  |
| 7  | MR. WESTBROOK: Richard B. Westbrook.                 |
| 8  | Was there analysis of the accidents or understanding |
| 9  | of the dangerous part of the intersections that      |
| 10 | would be added to in terms of traffic flow in this   |
| 11 | general area? Was that part of your analysis?        |
| 12 | MR.LERNER: For phase 1 type of analysis              |
| 13 | we generally do not conduct safety studies, that     |
| 14 | would come in later in a different phase of the      |
| 15 | analysis.  |
| 16 | MR. WESTBROOK: You are not aware that                |
| 17 | the intersection of South Capitol Street and I       |
| 18 | Street had the second to the most accidents, second  |
| 19 | only to Bladensburg Road and New York Avenue?        |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: South Capitol and               |
| 21 | I?   |
| 22 | MR. WESTBROOK: I would like to have him              |
| 23 | examine this picture of my car, a year ago, October  |
| 24 | 4 at that intersection, the results of a gentleman   |
| 25 | going 50 miles per hour up South Capitol Street and  |
| 26 | ripping off the front end of my car. It is a         |

| 1  | dangerous intersection. They cited him, gave him a   |
|----|--|
| 2  | ticket.  |
| 3  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Westbrook, I                |
| 4  | had an accident at that same intersection March 3 of |
| 5  | this year.   |
| 6  | MR. WESTBROOK: Which way were you                    |
| 7  | going?   |
| 8  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: I was coming from               |
| 9  | Anacostia, getting ready to go up the ramp to enter  |
| 10 | the freeway.   |
| 11 | MR. WESTBROOK: Well this gentleman was               |
| 12 | going straight up South Capitol Street. The police   |
| 13 | officer was sitting waiting to go up the ramp, saw   |
| 14 | the guy through the red light, she said at least 50  |
| 15 | miles per hour.                                      |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Well we got a few               |
| 17 |  |
| 18 | MR. WESTBROOK: Thank God for no-lock                 |
| 19 | brakes or I would probably still be in the hospital. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Let me interject                |
| 21 | here. For all the years that I have been sitting     |
| 22 | here, most of the traffic analyses at this stage     |
| 23 | anyhow, don't include the number of accidents.       |
| 24 | Although we do accept testimony about the relative   |
| 25 | safety and the efficiency with which traffic volumes |
| 26 | can actually pass through an intersection.           |

| 1  | MR.LERNER: And let me mention that the               |
|----|--|
| 2  | traffic report does make recommendations that some   |
| 3  | of the streets in the immediate vicinity of the      |
| 4  | site, of curbs being improved, pavement being        |
| 5  | improved because the current condition of some of    |
| 6  | those streets is below the desirable levels and some |
| 7  | of the recommendations are part of the study which   |
| 8  | is an improvement in safety is to repave some of     |
| 9  | those streets, improve some of the curbs along the   |
| 10 | street and make it work better from the point of     |
| 11 | view of capacity and safety.                         |
| 12 | MR. WESTBROOK: Does your analysis also               |
| 13 | take into consideration the speed of the automobiles |
| 14 | on South Capitol Street and the adverse impact on    |
| 15 | adjacent land use, existing and proposed.            |
| 16 | MR.LERNER: Once again our analysis at                |
| 17 | the phase 1 level of detail would not take into      |
| 18 | consideration would not take into consideration any  |
| 19 | of these safety issues associated with a proposed    |
| 20 | development. Those are issues that we typically      |
| 21 | deal with at a late stage of the analysis.           |
| 22 | MR. WESTBROOK: So you are not familiar               |
| 23 | with the longstanding concern that strictly the      |
| 24 | speed and the volume of traffic of South Capitol     |
| 25 | Street has been a negative aspect to potential       |
| 26 | development and also planning a number of decades?   |

| 1  | MR.LERNER: I am not saying I am not                  |
|----|--|
| 2  | familiar with the concerns about speed along South   |
| 3  | Capitol Street, what I am saying is that those type  |
| 4  | of considerations, speed and safety issues, are not  |
| 5  | the type of things that we bring into the analysis   |
| 6  | based on this stage.                                 |
| 7  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Waldron do you              |
| 8  | have questions?                                      |
| 9  | MR. WALDRON: Yes I do.                               |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Let me just know,               |
| 11 | we are going to lose a quorum at about 10:30, so as  |
| 12 | efficiently as we can, we would like to try to move  |
| 13 | through both cross examination and direct testimony. |
| 14 | Thank you.   |
| 15 | MR. WALDRON: Peter Waldron. How many                 |
| 16 | years will this trolley service be paid for by the   |
| 17 | developer?   |
| 18 | MR.LERNER: As far as what the traffic                |
| 19 | study recommended was that shuttle be provided on a  |
| 20 | continuous basis and that is perhaps something the   |
| 21 | developer could answer better than I can. At this    |
| 22 | point our recommendation is that a shuttle be        |
| 23 | provided to make the best use of the existing Metro  |
| 24 | station. How long the developer will be able to      |
| 25 | provide it that is something perhaps that should be  |
| 26 | asked of the developer.                              |

| 1  | MR. WALDRON: Two quick questions then.               |
|----|--|
| 2  | What would be its hours, what's your recommendation  |
| 3  | for its hours?                                       |
| 4  | MR.LERNER: I don't recollect directly.               |
| 5  | I think we recommend either 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.,  |
| 6  | if I remember correctly.                             |
| 7  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: This will be a                  |
| 8  | shuttle between the site and the Metro?              |
| 9  | MR.LERNER: That is correct. A shuttle                |
| 10 | that will run pretty much all day connecting the     |
| 11 | Metro to the site.                                   |
| 12 | MR. WALDRON: A low                                   |
| 13 | MR.LERNER: Right, a low speed shuttle.               |
| 14 | (Laughter.)  |
| 15 | MR. WALDRON: Well I think that is                    |
| 16 | important.   |
| 17 | MR.LERNER: The distance between Metro                |
| 18 | and the site is approximately 1,700 feet. So you     |
| 19 | wouldn't need to run it very fast to provide         |
| 20 | frequent service. You could go very slowly and       |
| 21 | provide frequent service.                            |
| 22 | MR. WALDRON: So you are not                          |
| 23 | recommending that it run at night?                   |
| 24 | MR.LERNER: At this point we are                      |
| 25 | recommending that it run from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. |
| 26 | MR. WALDRON: Thank you.                              |

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 (202) 234-4433 (202) 234-4433

| 1  | MR. SIMON: Could we ask a member from                |
|----|--|
| 2  | the team to discuss or explain the financing for the |
| 3  | shuttle? Mr. Lerner indicated that it was his        |
| 4  | thought but we would like to know from the team.     |
| 5  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Sure.                           |
| 6  | MR. ANDERSON: My name is John Anderson               |
| 7  | of Florida Rock Properties. We will have that        |
| 8  | detail at the next submission, for the second stage. |
| 9  | We don't think we think we are ahead of our          |
| 10 | headlights with that right now. We will be glad to   |
| 11 | give you details when the time is appropriate.       |
| 12 | Thank you.   |
| 13 | MR. SIMON: Thank you.                                |
| 14 | MR. WESTBROOK: I have a question of                  |
| 15 | another member of the team.                          |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Sure.                           |
| 17 | MR. WESTBROOK: It would be Mr. Richard               |
| 18 | Haase.   |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Haase.                      |
| 20 | MR. WESTBROOK: Mr. Haase we have a                   |
| 21 | letter that was written by you and sent to various   |
| 22 | people that were on the in this contested case.      |
| 23 | I was wondering if you could enlighten us or         |
| 24 | elaborate on what is the time frame for the review   |
| 25 | of the existing DOT situation. When does their       |
| 26 | lease expire? When would this study have to be done  |

| 1  | that is usually undertaken by GSA, it is my          |
|----|--|
| 2  | understanding to determine whether you would build   |
| 3  | new facilities or whether they would go out and      |
| 4  | rent, lease additional facilities, or stay where     |
| 5  | they are? I you had a lot of experience in that      |
| 6  | line of work and I wish you could enlighten us give  |
| 7  | us some kind of a time table here.                   |
| 8  | MR. HAASE: I would be happy to. What                 |
| 9  | is actually happening in this case is that DOT has   |
| 10 | initiated what's called an 11b report for the        |
| 11 | Congress to look at. What used to be the Department  |
| 12 | of Public Works and Transportation and which is now  |
| 13 | renamed the Department of Public Works and           |
| 14 | Infrastructure has taken up this 11b and has passed  |
| 15 | to the full House. It is over on the Senate side as  |
| 16 | we speak, now waiting for approval. The people that  |
| 17 | I have spoken to anticipate a fall passing of the    |
| 18 | bill to come out. And my question to them is will    |
| 19 | it have to go to conference at this particular time. |
| 20 | And they said, no, GSA would accept the stricter of  |
| 21 | the two houses' recommendations. So if in fact       |
| 22 | since has already been passed by the House, it is    |
| 23 | over on the Senate side, if it is passed by the      |
| 24 | Senate and a fall situation exists, that would be a  |
| 25 | goal for GSA.  |
| 26 | Now the lease on the existing building               |

| 1  | at the Department of Transportation, as I understand |
|----|--|
| 2  | it, is in a hold over position. So it is what we     |
| 3  | call a short term situation not a short term but     |
| 4  | we are obviously be there until everything is        |
| 5  | constructed or it's approved. But GSA would then     |
| 6  | put out their bids upon approval of the Senate and   |
| 7  | House side sometime in late fall.                    |
| 8  | MR. WESTBROOK: But then GSA has to do                |
| 9  | like a request for proposals?                        |
| 10 | MR. HAASE: Yes, they would go to                     |
| 11 | competitive bids, yes.                               |
| 12 | MR. WESTBROOK: Are you familiar with                 |
| 13 | the article that appeared in The Washington Business |
| 14 | Journal in their they do a weekly newspaper          |
| 15 | MR. HAASE: Yes I am familiar with it.                |
| 16 | MR. WESTBROOK: April 25 to May 1                     |
| 17 | where the comment from the representative for the    |
| 18 | Charles E. Smith Company, who has the management     |
| 19 | aspects of the David Nassif Associates, who are      |
| 20 | Boston based, and he said, "`We intend to take all   |
| 21 | steps necessary to make sure that the Nassif         |
| 22 | building is a strong competitor to keep the DOT      |
| 23 | from,' said Jim George, a Boston attorney who        |
| 24 | represents Nassif." So, I am sorry it wasn't         |
| 25 | Charles E. Smith, but the reason Charles E. Smith    |
| 26 | took the job was because they thought they could     |

| 1  | keep DOT in the Nassii building.                     |
|----|--|
| 2  | MR. HAASE: Well all I can say to that                |
| 3  | is DOT initiated this 11b proposal. So obviously if  |
| 4  | they wanted to stay there or they had any thoughts   |
| 5  | of staying there or they had any strong inclination  |
| 6  | from the developer that he was going to make it a    |
| 7  | building that they really wanted to be in we         |
| 8  | wouldn't have initiated this report.                 |
| 9  | MR. WESTBROOK: Well they still have to               |
| 10 | have competitive bids.                               |
| 11 | MR. HAASE: Right. Certainly. I don't                 |
| 12 | think they meet the space requirement either.        |
| 13 | MR. WESTBROOK: Are you aware that the                |
| 14 | Nassif building is in Advisory Neighborhood          |
| 15 | Commission 2D?                                       |
| 16 | MR. HAASE: I am not but I am very                    |
| 17 | familiar with the Nassif building.                   |
| 18 | MR. WESTBROOK: And are you                           |
| 19 | knowledgeable that it is also in my single member    |
| 20 | district? So you know where I am coming from.        |
| 21 | MR. HAASE: The only thing I can say                  |
| 22 | about that is you are not going to be losing, the    |
| 23 | good news and the bad news. That building will be    |
| 24 | backfilled by somebody.                              |
| 25 | MR. WESTBROOK: Well, we have another                 |
| 26 | backfill problem when EPA moves out of the Waterside |

| 1  | Mall.  |
|----|--|
| 2  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Now we're                     |
| 3  | testifying.  |
| 4  | MR. WESTBROOK: Okay we are talking                 |
| 5  | about backfill problems and                        |
| 6  | MR. HAASE: Well the Nassif building is             |
| 7  | a little different than the Waterside building.    |
| 8  | MR. WESTBROOK: A lot different.                    |
| 9  | MR. HAASE: A lot different.                        |
| 10 | MR. WALDRON: A few questions. Peter                |
| 11 | Waldron. Are you engaged in any conversations with |
| 12 | anyone at DOT at present?                          |
| 13 | MR. HAASE: I am not but the team is.               |
| 14 | MR. WALDRON: The team is. And GSA?                 |
| 15 | MR. HAASE: I have with the GSA yes.                |
| 16 | MR. WALDRON: But the team has or                   |
| 17 | hasn't?  |
| 18 | MR. HAASE: With GSA?                               |
| 19 | MR. WALDRON: Yes.                                  |
| 20 | MR. HAASE: I don't know. I haven't                 |
| 21 | inquired but that is my job, to liaison with GSA.  |
| 22 | MR. WALDRON: And the 11b report, is                |
| 23 | that a GSA or DOT initiative?                      |
| 24 | MR. HAASE: DOT initiative.                         |
| 25 | MR. WALDRON: It is DOT initiative,                 |
| 26 | thank you.   |

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 (202) 234-4433 (202) 234-4433

| 1  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: All right.                     |
|----|---|
| 2  | MR. SIMON: Just a question or two. The              |
| 3  | portal site also happens to be in Mr. Westbrook's   |
| 4  | MR. HAASE: If I were him I would be                 |
| 5  | very happy at this time.                            |
| 6  | MR. SIMON: Well, he will speak for                  |
| 7  | himself about his pleasure. But I am not quite sure |
| 8  | how to get to this point. You had mentioned the     |
| 9  | issue about the hotels on this site. And let me try |
| 10 | to ask it this way. Perhaps I can, as they say,     |
| 11 | refresh your memory, had you heard anything about   |
| 12 | the SwissAir hotel assigning to build a hotel on    |
| 13 | this site.  |
| 14 | MR. HAASE: As I understand Mr. Fuller               |
| 15 | has just commented on that particular item. As I    |
| 16 | understand they are in the process.                 |
| 17 | Let me put on my appraiser hat and                  |
| 18 | answer your question from the hotel standpoint.     |
| 19 | Obviously if you are going to build a hotel at this |
| 20 | stage with the government impact that you have down |
| 21 | there, you have to offer a government a tremendous  |
| 22 | reduction in dollar amounts. The government rents   |
| 23 | for \$69 to \$75 a night where the rack rate, room  |
| 24 | rate is typically in the \$120 range. If you ask a  |
| 25 | developer to compute his construction figures       |
| 26 | against those kind of figures on occupancy, average |

| 1  | daily rate from a discount rate, he would say there  |
|----|--|
| 2  | is no way I can make.                                |
| 3  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: What is the rack                |
| 4  | rate?  |
| 5  | MR. HAASE: The rack rate is a                        |
| 6  | theoretical rate that they quote                     |
| 7  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: What is the                     |
| 8  | MR. HAASE: The average daily rate is                 |
| 9  | what they actually get. A rack rate might be if you  |
| 10 | went to the Marriott and you called and said what is |
| 11 | a one bedroom, they would say \$175. And if you went |
| 12 | over there and said give me your best rate and they  |
| 13 | had 30 percent vacancy they would say \$125.         |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Okay what was that              |
| 15 | you quoted just now? You were saying government      |
| 16 | discount, is that \$69 to \$70                       |
| 17 | MR. HAASE: Well, the government                      |
| 18 | discount rate is somewhere around \$65 to \$75.      |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: And what would                  |
| 20 | normally be going?                                   |
| 21 | MR. HAASE: Probably \$125 to \$150. It               |
| 22 | would probably cost you right now, 200,000 dollars a |
| 23 | room to build a hotel.                               |
| 24 | MR. SIMON: Just to finish that thought,              |
| 25 | I wasn't sure from your remarks before on the portal |
| 26 | site if you were taking into account that the        |

| 1  | Fairmont Hotel had been slated to go into that site? |
|----|--|
| 2  | MR. HAASE: Yes.                                      |
| 3  | MR. SIMON: You were?                                 |
| 4  | MR. HAASE: Very familiar, yes.                       |
| 5  | MR. SIMON: And you are familiar with                 |
| 6  | their financial situation?                           |
| 7  | MR. HAASE: Yes but I was making a point              |
| 8  | that this was probably six, seven years ago when     |
| 9  | nobody leaped into that particular site, it was      |
| 10 | ready to go as a hotel.                              |
| 11 | MR. SIMON: Well, but of course, there                |
| 12 | was the RTC, there were issues having to do with the |
| 13 | partnerships.  |
| 14 | MR. HAASE: Yes, but that is also one of              |
| 15 | the finer sites, I think, in town, the portal site,  |
| 16 | as is the Washington Harbor site.                    |
| 17 | MR. WESTBROOK: Are you familiar with                 |
| 18 | the Fairmont was to be a                             |
| 19 | MR. HAASE: Yes.                                      |
| 20 | MR. WESTBROOK: four star, five star,                 |
| 21 | whatever, and that the clientele was to be people,   |
| 22 | you know, lawyers, engineers, visiting               |
| 23 | MR. HAASE: Yes.                                      |
| 24 | MR. WESTBROOK: and government rates                  |
| 25 | were no involved?                                    |
| 26 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Let me interrupt.               |

| 1  | My colleagues are asking what the relevance of this  |
|----|--|
| 2  | is. And I guess what I am hearing is fuller          |
| 3  | discussion of about the feasibility of locating a    |
| 4  | hotel or some kind of residential use in this area.  |
| 5  | But I am sensing that my colleagues have heard what  |
| 6  | they need to hear sufficient to give them some       |
| 7  | direction about the mixed use nature or the lack of  |
| 8  | mixed use nature in this area. And I think they      |
| 9  | have probably settled as far as the feasibility of   |
| 10 | hotels from what they have heard. And if not they    |
| 11 | are looking at the clock with 22 minutes left before |
| 12 | we lose a quorum. So they are asking that we move    |
| 13 | on.  |
| 14 | MR. SIMON: Thank you very much.                      |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Do you have                     |
| 16 | questions of other members of the team.              |
| 17 | MR. SIMON: Yes we do.                                |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: We might need to                |
| 19 | schedule another night.                              |
| 20 | MR. SIMON: Could we ask Mr. Anderson if              |
| 21 | he would come back?                                  |
| 22 | Mr. Waldron has some questions.                      |
| 23 | MR. WALDRON: Peter Waldron. Hello Mr.                |
| 24 | Anderson. I have three questions. Mr Nixon had       |
| 25 | indicated that your company, FRP, was going to       |
| 26 | donate the land to ECC and I believe at the last     |

| 1  | hearing that there was some indication that you      |
|----|--|
| 2  | didn't own the land. Could you clarify that for us?  |
| 3  | MR. ANDERSON: I had hoped you asked                  |
| 4  | that question. My name is John Anderson of Florida   |
| 5  | Rock Properties. We expect to close a week from      |
| 6  | today, we would be glad if you would like to verify  |
| 7  | that with the seller, Mr. Moore, but we do expect to |
| 8  | close within a week from today.                      |
| 9  | MR. WALDRON: And is there a                          |
| 10 | relationship you could then maybe then have the      |
| 11 | privilege of raising 5 million dollars, are there    |
| 12 | any conditions that they raise the money they would  |
| 13 | get the land, I was unsure about that?               |
| 14 | MR. ANDERSON: That is a specific                     |
| 15 | pleasure reserved for them.                          |
| 16 | MR. WALDRON: So there are no conditions              |
| 17 | between the donation and the raising money?          |
| 18 | MR. ANDERSON: Let me clarify that if I               |
| 19 | might. Our donation of the first half of site 664    |
| 20 | east is contingent upon our first and second stage   |
| 21 | approval and getting the DOT on that site, on our    |
| 22 | PUD site. Otherwise there are no we expect and       |
| 23 | intend and have committed to give them the first     |
| 24 | half of the site, fee simple, no strings attached,   |
| 25 | for their use.                                       |
| 26 | MR. WALDRON: And then one last                       |

| 1  | question. I think you said, "It would be our desire  |
|----|--|
| 2  | to donate this land." Are there circumstances that   |
| 3  | would prevent the Florida Rock from donating this    |
| 4  | land, any circumstances, because you said it would   |
| 5  | be your desire?                                      |
| 6  | MR. ANDERSON: I don't follow that                    |
| 7  | language. I would be glad to repeat what I just      |
| 8  | said in terms of our agreement, which is in writing  |
| 9  | and available if you would like to see it. In fact   |
| 10 | you should have a copy anyway.                       |
| 11 | MR. SIMON: No, I am sorry we don't.                  |
| 12 | MR. FRANKLIN: I might observe that if                |
| 13 | the Commission were to approve this PUD, I would     |
| 14 | assume it would be a requirement for the donation,   |
| 15 | it would be a legal requirement regarding that       |
| 16 | matter, notwithstanding the state of mind that you   |
| 17 | might have at the present.                           |
| 18 | MR. SIMON: Thank you.                                |
| 19 | MR. ANDERSON: Like I said, that                      |
| 20 | donation is contingent upon first and second stage   |
| 21 | approval and the attainment of the DOT or some       |
| 22 | similar tenant.                                      |
| 23 | MR. SIMON: Mr. Anderson Gottlieb                     |
| 24 | Simon when PUDs involve donations of housing         |
| 25 | assistance and other kinds of things, ordinarily the |
| 26 | applicant will submit to the Commission a            |

| 1  | description of amounts and kinds of assistance that  |
|----|--|
| 2  | are being provided.                                  |
| 3  | MR. ANDERSON: At this stage, at this                 |
| 4  | level of application?                                |
| 5  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: What is the                     |
| 6  | question? Give us the punchline.                     |
| 7  | MR. SIMON: I hadn't quiet finished the               |
| 8  | question. The question part was, could you indicate  |
| 9  | to us or if you can't when you could indicate what   |
| 10 | the total value of contributions and aid and         |
| 11 | assistance to community organizations, including but |
| 12 | not limited to the ECC?                              |
| 13 | MR. ANDERSON: I would be prepared for                |
| 14 | that at some later time, probably at, very close or  |
| 15 | closer to the second stage.                          |
| 16 | MR. SIMON: Closer to the second stage?               |
| 17 | MR. ANDERSON: This is much to early for              |
| 18 | that.  |
| 19 | MR. SIMON: Thank you again Mr.                       |
| 20 | Anderson.  |
| 21 | MR. WESTBROOK: I have a question of Dr.              |
| 22 | Fuller, is he here?                                  |
| 23 | I am not sure I recall your testimony                |
| 24 | but what I would like to have you elaborate on is    |
| 25 | the effects of federal government downsizing in the  |
| 26 | city of Washington and of course the metropolitan    |

| 1   | area, how far have we gone so far? How much more     |
|-----|--|
| 2   | are we going to see? How much of a backfill problem  |
| 3   | are we having or going to have when we fill up these |
| 4   | spaces that are under construction that are owned by |
| 5   | the federal government or international agencies?    |
| 6   | That is another clue of what is happening to our     |
| 7   | office market, the private owned office market.      |
| 8   | Could you elaborate help us out on that?             |
| 9   | DR. FULLER: Yes. My name is Steve                    |
| 10  | Fuller. We have lost about 40,000 federal jobs in    |
| 11  | four years and 9,000 District government jobs. That  |
| 12  | is sort of the bad news. The good news is that for   |
| 13  | every month this year through the first seven the    |
| 14  | District of Columbia has added private sector jobs   |
| 15  | over the year before for the same month. The         |
| 16  | private sector is growing in the District and that   |
| 17  | has brought about low vacancy rates. The forecast    |
| 18  | for the next year is that total employment in the    |
| 19  | District will go up for the first time since 1992.   |
| 20  | One of the elements that is driving that             |
| 21  | turnaround is that the federal government is         |
| 22  | actually moving jobs back into the District. Still   |
| 23  | reducing the workforce but it is bringing jobs back  |
| 24  | in, 1,600 jobs this summer or as we speak really     |
| 25  | from Rosslyn into the Ronald Reagan Building, that's |
| 2.6 | AID, nearly 7,000 Naval personnel moving from        |

| 1  | Crystal City by the year 2002 to the Navy Yard.      |
|----|--|
| 2  | The downsizing of several agencies has               |
| 3  | created vacant spaces and GSA, the national capital, |
| 4  | has a task force that is looking at leases in the    |
| 5  | suburbs for opportunities to bring as they role over |
| 6  | and as they expire. Probably after the year 2000,    |
| 7  | but in the next two or three years to bring those    |
| 8  | workers back into government owned space. And there  |
| 9  | are opportunities to do that as some of the          |
| 10 | renovations that are under way are complete. So I    |
| 11 | think the outlook for the District is quite          |
| 12 | positive. It will not grow fast but there is job     |
| 13 | growth across all sectors.                           |
| 14 | And the Navy will, as it relocates these             |
| 15 | personnel into the District at the Navy Yard will    |
| 16 | create demands for office space and ultimately       |
| 17 | within 15 or 20 years for residential and hotel      |
| 18 | space in this area. But the first step is to create  |
| 19 | investor confidence in this area and that is what    |
| 20 | this project does, it gets investors paying          |
| 21 | attention to this area as possible opportunities for |
| 22 | future development. And the job market is            |
| 23 | supporting that now.                                 |
| 24 | MR. WESTBROOK: Is the federal                        |
| 25 | employment increasing or are you saying it has got   |
| 26 | to be a private market?                              |

| 1  | DR. FULLER: What I'm saying is the                   |
|----|--|
| 2  | employment will increase at the expense of the       |
| 3  | suburbs. So when we look at the total metropolitan   |
| 4  | area, the federal government downsizing is projected |
| 5  | to continue at least through 1999. I would guess on  |
| 6  | the order of another 15,000 jobs beyond what we have |
| 7  | lost now. But they have historically, starting in    |
| 8  | mid 1993, they came largely out of the District.     |
| 9  | And because of that they have created opportunities  |
| 10 | to backfill publicly owned space, federal space in   |
| 11 | the District and that will come at the expense of    |
| 12 | the suburbs. So in fact the federal employment base  |
| 13 | is expected to start growing again after the year    |
| 14 | 2002.  |
| 15 | MR. WESTBROOK: Well don't you think it               |
| 16 | could also be moving into owned spaced at the        |
| 17 | expense of some leased in D.C. as well?              |
| 18 | DR. FULLER: It is possible                           |
| 19 | MR. WESTBROOK: Like EPA.                             |
| 20 | DR. FULLER: regardless that the                      |
| 21 | downsizing has left small spaces, they are not whole |
| 22 | buildings, sitting around. They are not headquarter  |
| 23 | buildings. They are smaller spaces. I mean other     |
| 24 | than the Ronald Reagan Building, but mainly that is  |
| 25 | coming out of leased space.                          |
|    |  |

MR. WESTBROOK: And other than EPA.

26

| 1  | DR. FULLER: Well, there is more than                |
|----|---|
| 2  | EPA going in there. There is going to be some       |
| 3  | churning. But these buildings that are being        |
| 4  | vacated are old buildings, they are C class         |
| 5  | buildings at best. And many of those buildings will |
| 6  | renovated and made available over a period of time  |
| 7  | for private sector, other public, or nonprofit use. |
| 8  | So these buildings won't sit empty forever. They    |
| 9  | will have to be renovated. The same is going to     |
| 10 | happen in Crystal City.                             |
| 11 | MR. FRANKLIN: With all due respect,                 |
| 12 | Madame Chair, I find the seminar is fascinating but |
| 13 | I don't know where this is heading. What is the     |
| 14 | thrust of this question?                            |
| 15 | MR. WESTBROOK: What is the market for               |
| 16 | these building?                                     |
| 17 | MR. FRANKLIN: Excuse me?                            |
| 18 | MR. WESTBROOK: What is the market for               |
| 19 | these proposed buildings?                           |
| 20 | MR. FRANKLIN: Well, I think no one has              |
| 21 | the answer to that question Mr. Westbrook.          |
| 22 | MR. WESTBROOK: Thank you.                           |
| 23 | MR. FRANKLIN: And I have been raising               |
| 24 | questions about that too. And we discover if we     |
| 25 | approve this whether there is a market or not. And  |
| 26 | maybe we will have to revisit in two years whether  |

| 1  | this PUD approval, if we give it, should be          |
|----|--|
| 2  | extended. But no one is going to your satisfaction   |
| 3  | or mine, be able to predict what the market is at    |
| 4  | the moment, even Dr. Fuller. His crystal ball is as  |
| 5  | good as anybody's.                                   |
| 6  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: We're trying to                 |
| 7  | find another date. We are into the month of          |
| 8  | November. Are there questions of others?             |
| 9  | MR. SIMON: Yes, we have some questions               |
| 10 | for the economic analysis of the Seal, Bowman, Prost |
| 11 | & Associates report.                                 |
| 12 | MR. PROST: Good evening, James Prost.                |
| 13 | MR. SIMON: Good to meet you Mr. Prost.               |
| 14 | Gottlieb Simon. I am going to try to do this         |
| 15 | quickly but I understand these things are            |
| 16 | complicated. This is a page from the Prost report,   |
| 17 | this one happens to have some of my handwriting on   |
| 18 | it, this is the page that shows the residential FAR  |
| 19 | section and other sections are similar in terms of   |
| 20 | some of the questions I want to ask.                 |
| 21 | MR. PROST: Okay.                                     |
| 22 | MR. SIMON: Could I stand right there                 |
| 23 | with you?  |
| 24 | MR. PROST: Sure.                                     |
| 25 | MR. SIMON: I don't know if the                       |
| 26 | Commission wants to follow this or not, but in terms |

| 1  | of being able to understand the financial viability  |
|----|--|
| 2  | of some of the issues that are going on, it seemed   |
| 3  | important for us to be able to understand the chart  |
| 4  | Mr. Prost and we may be asking some dumb questions   |
| 5  | because this not our everyday kind of thing.         |
| 6  | MR. PROST: There are no dumb questions.              |
| 7  | MR. SIMON: Okay. But while I may not                 |
| 8  | be an expert on math, a couple things like addition  |
| 9  | are kind of my thing. So I couldn't understand why   |
| 10 | under hard cost, office retail was zero, residential |
| 11 | hotel was 26880, do you see where I am going?        |
| 12 | MR. PROST: Yes.                                      |
| 13 | MR. SIMON: The subtotal wasn't equal to              |
| 14 | the two preceding numbers.                           |
| 15 | MR. PROST: First of all this is just a               |
| 16 | pro forma for the residential so there is no         |
| 17 | commercial.  |
| 18 | MR. SIMON: I am clear on that. The                   |
| 19 | question I have is why wouldn't 28886 add up to      |
| 20 | 31404? Why wouldn't those be the same two numbers    |
| 21 | there? You have a line called "subtotal hard         |
| 22 | costs." And since residential hotel is the only      |
| 23 | hard cost above it, shouldn't residential hard costs |
| 24 | then, subtotal hard costs be the same number?        |
| 25 | MR. PROST: I guess they should be. I                 |
| 26 | am looking at the numbers here and the numbers in    |

| 1  | terms of total hard cost which are 31 million        |
|----|--|
| 2  | dollars and total soft cost and total land cost do   |
| 3  | add up to the 467 so it adds up as far as I am       |
| 4  | concerned.   |
| 5  | MR. SIMON: Those are the numbers.                    |
| 6  | MR. PROST: The totals add up. Thirty-                |
| 7  | one is the subtotal of the hard costs, soft costs is |
| 8  | 7, land cost is 7, adds up to 46                     |
| 9  | MR. SIMON: That's correct. But the                   |
| 10 | preceding numbers                                    |
| 11 | MR. PROST: I don't know what the                     |
| 12 | preceding number is.                                 |
| 13 | MR. SIMON: Let me ask you about another              |
| 14 | one and this one I did make a larger chart so that   |
| 15 | we all look at the same time. Mr. Prost I don't      |
| 16 | understand, so please help me why 20 percent of hard |
| 17 | costs and the residential hard costs are \$105, I    |
| 18 | don't understand why 20 percent of 105 is 31.28.     |
| 19 | MR. PROST: I don't know which table                  |
| 20 | that is cut out of. It's                             |
| 21 | MR. SIMON: Right here sir, you can see               |
| 22 | it right here.                                       |
| 23 | MR. PROST: I don't know why it is off                |
| 24 | 71 cents. We can look at that detail later, yes it   |
| 25 | is off 71 cents.                                     |
| 26 | MR. SIMON: Sir, you say it is a detail,              |

| 1  | but I think when you add up all the details you will |
|----|--|
| 2  | find that the costs that you project for residential |
| 3  | are significantly different than the numbers that    |
| 4  | are shown here if you in fact use a \$20 a square    |
| 5  | foot rather than a \$30 dollar square foot soft cost |
| 6  | and if you push all the numbers aground. Now I may   |
| 7  | be missing something and you may not the opportunity |
| 8  | just standing here to see that. But I have to tell   |
| 9  | you that as far as I could tell, I couldn't find how |
| 10 | we could get to those numbers.                       |
| 11 | MR. PROST: Well, I mean, again, I would              |
| 12 | be happy to sit down with you and go over the        |
| 13 | detail. There are about 30 tables in here, each      |
| 14 | table has about 50 numbers so I would be happy to go |
| 15 | over the details. I think the basic conclusion, and  |
| 16 | we are not the only one who concluded this, that it  |
| 17 | is extremely difficult to in this particular market  |
| 18 | to make residential work. And we even used a lower   |
| 19 | cost per square foot for residential than we did for |
| 20 | the other developments to give it the benefit of the |
| 21 | doubt. So I don't think there is any basic           |
| 22 | conclusion that residential is not financially       |
| 23 | feasible. I would be happy to sit down and go over   |
| 24 | that detail and any other detail.                    |
| 25 | MR. SIMON: I was once in a situation                 |
| 26 | like this, a lawyer asked me, would you be surprised |

| 1  | if the residential was only half as expensive as the |
|----|--|
| 2  | numbers here project?                                |
| 3  | MR. PROST: Not to build this type of                 |
| 4  | construction. We are not talking about stick built.  |
| 5  | We are talking about high rise construction and I    |
| 6  | would be astounded if it was significantly lower for |
| 7  | non-stick built construction.                        |
| 8  | MR. SIMON: I mean the numbers on the                 |
| 9  | sheet that you were just looking at. What is this    |
| 10 | internal subsidy that is shown on the sheet sir?     |
| 11 | MR. PROST: It is shown as a deficit of               |
| 12 | \$65 a square foot.                                  |
| 13 | MR. SIMON: And if that was                           |
| 14 | significantly different, would that surprise you. I  |
| 15 | mean just based upon your own internal figure?       |
| 16 | MR. PROST: I don't think it would be                 |
| 17 | significant at all.                                  |
| 18 | MR. SIMON: Could you look at those                   |
| 19 | numbers after the hearing is over and let us know if |
| 20 | there are any changes which need to be made?         |
| 21 | MR. PROST: I would be happy to, this or              |
| 22 | any other table you want, have specific questions,   |
| 23 | would be happy to answer.                            |
| 24 | MR. SIMON: Thank you very much.                      |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Anyone else have                |
| 26 | questions of Mr. Prost?                              |

| 1  | (No response.)                                      |
|----|---|
| 2  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Do you have                    |
| 3  | questions of other witnesses?                       |
| 4  | MR. WESTBROOK: No.                                  |
| 5  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Waldron,                   |
| 6  | questions of other witnesses?                       |
| 7  | MR. WALDRON: No.                                    |
| 8  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Simon?                     |
| 9  | MR. SIMON: Madame Chair could I ask                 |
| 10 | just one more set of questions?                     |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Sure. We have                  |
| 12 | four minutes.                                       |
| 13 | MR. SIMON: I have couple questions                  |
| 14 | about jobs for whomever on the team is the          |
| 15 | appropriate person to ask about jobs.               |
| 16 | MR. FRANKLIN: I wonder sir if you could             |
| 17 | reserve your right to question because I am very    |
| 18 | anxious to hear the position that you have on the   |
| 19 | project and that will enable me to judge much more  |
| 20 | efficiently the relevance of you questions. Are you |
| 21 | three here to oppose this project?                  |
| 22 | MR. SIMON: Yes, Mr. Franklin. Both                  |
| 23 | ANCs have submitted letters of opposition.          |
| 24 | MR. FRANKLIN: And the basis for the                 |
| 25 | opposition, if you could just go to you testimony,  |
| 26 | if the chair doesn't mind, then I wouldn't find it  |
|    |   |

| 1  | as difficult exactly what the drift of some of these |
|----|--|
| 2  | questions is.  |
| 3  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: That's taking us                |
| 4  | out of order.  |
| 5  | MR. FRANKLIN: Well then don't.                       |
| 6  | MR. SIMON: Mr. Franklin, if you do have              |
| 7  | handy the ANC reports, they would give you quick     |
| 8  | overview of the Commissions positions.               |
| 9  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: He may have done                |
| 10 | like I did and left it in my packet that is about    |
| 11 | this big at home.                                    |
| 12 | MR. PARSONS: I am selling copies down                |
| 13 | at this end.   |
| 14 | (Laughter.)  |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Let try to finish               |
| 16 | up the cross examination and then we will start that |
| 17 | in November with the Office of Planning report. Who  |
| 18 | from the applicant's panel is best able to handle    |
| 19 | questions regarding job generation?                  |
| 20 | MS. GIARDANO: That's too vague. Maybe                |
| 21 | you could ask the question.                          |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Why don't you ask               |
| 23 | the question so that they can determine who best     |
| 24 | MR. SIMON: Certainly, that is fine.                  |
| 25 | One of the important aspects that has been promised  |
|    |  |

| 1  | there have been any discussions with any contractors |
|----|--|
| 2  | on methods that they will use to ensure that         |
| 3  | residents of our neighborhoods will have an          |
| 4  | opportunity, not just an opportunity, will have an   |
| 5  | excellent opportunity to achieve those jobs?         |
| 6  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Okay. Mr.                       |
| 7  | Anderson.  |
| 8  | MS. SMALLWOOD: I am Commissioner                     |
| 9  | Juanita Smallwood, but I represent 6B-02             |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: And you were                    |
| 11 | wonderful on the                                     |
| 12 | MS. SMALLWOOD: It seems that I am not                |
| 13 | going to be able to give testimony to talk about the |
| 14 | Florida Rock and the ECC because so much time has    |
| 15 | been taken up.                                       |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: That's right, not               |
| 17 | tonight.   |
| 18 | MS. SMALLWOOD: There are a lot of other              |
| 19 | folks in this room that have important issues to     |
| 20 | talk about.  |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: I understand but                |
| 22 | we are identifying another date and time so that you |
| 23 | will be able to                                      |
| 24 | MS. SMALLWOOD: the positions that                    |
| 25 | Gottlieb Simon was just getting ready to give out    |
| 26 | information about, for the record Gottlieb, could    |

| 1  | you just clear for me                                |
|----|--|
| 2  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Ms. Smallwood that              |
| 3  | is out of order. And let me finish please. We have   |
| 4  | tried to identify another date and time so that you  |
| 5  | and others who would like to testify but who have    |
| 6  | not had an opportunity to do so in the sessions that |
| 7  | we have had will be able to so. We are not at the    |
| 8  | point where the ANC is giving its oral statement     |
| 9  | just yet. What they have done is submitted it into   |
| 10 | the record in a letter form. And when they get an    |
| 11 | opportunity to give their testimony you will be able |
| 12 | to hear them and they will have to stand cross       |
| 13 | examination just like applicant's people are         |
| 14 | standing cross examination now. Do you see what I    |
| 15 | am saying? And I have to apologize that we did not   |
| 16 | know that I thought we would be able to wrap         |
| 17 | things up tonight. But we have to let the process    |
| 18 | take its course. And each of the applicant's         |
| 19 | witnesses must stand cross examination. So it is     |
| 20 | taking much longer than any of us thought. I didn't  |
| 21 | expect it to take an hour or however long it has     |
| 22 | taken so far. What I would like to be able to do is  |
| 23 | wrap up cross examination tonight so that when we    |
| 24 | come back in November we are able to start with the  |
| 25 | report of the Office of Planning, the report of      |
| 26 | other agencies, then the report of Advisory          |

| 1  | Neighborhood Commissions 6B and 2D, then persons in  |
|----|--|
| 2  | support, then persons in opposition. Okay that is    |
| 3  | the balance of the agenda as we will move through as |
| 4  | orderly as possible. And I am sorry that has taken   |
| 5  | so much time and that other people have had to go    |
| 6  | home. But that is our process. And we have to find   |
| 7  | another date so that everyone can come back and give |
| 8  | us their full testimony and participate.             |
| 9  | MS. SMALLWOOD: Okay.                                 |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Thank you.                      |
| 11 | MR. SIMON: Madame Chair, we have had                 |
| 12 | lots of experience trying to make sure that          |
| 13 | residents of our neighborhoods get jobs on           |
| 14 | construction sites, so I was wondering whether or    |
| 15 | not on the team had talked to a contractor in        |
| 16 | advance, same way they make conversations about      |
| 17 | designs and availability of contractors to discuss   |
| 18 | this issue.  |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Okay, Mr.                       |
| 20 | Anderson.  |
| 21 | MR. ANDERSON: Yes. The question is                   |
| 22 | jobs?  |
| 23 | MR. SIMON: Yes. Mr. Anderson, have you               |
| 24 | or any members of the team talked to any contractors |
| 25 | with regard to assuring the residents of our         |
| 26 | neighborhoods will get jobs? As you know             |

| 1  | frequently, despite people's good intentions unless  |
|----|--|
| 2  | there has been a lot of work with the contractor it  |
| 3  | doesn't happen. And I know you have good             |
| 4  | intentions, but we need this kind of preparations.   |
| 5  | MR. ANDERSON: I would say this, of                   |
| 6  | course, as you well know, until and unless this      |
| 7  | actual construction happens of the PUD there is no   |
| 8  | construction nor no contractors. On the other hand   |
| 9  | with our partnership with the ECC already and I      |
| 10 | think as you guys know, we have one or two           |
| 11 | industrial tenants. They have some 20 to 30          |
| 12 | existing ongoing jobs as far as these aggregate      |
| 13 | operations on these properties now. We have put the  |
| 14 | community in touch through the Earth Conservation    |
| 15 | Corps with those operators in hopes as openings      |
| 16 | occur, and I can tell there is a very active         |
| 17 | interest on the part of these operators to hire      |
| 18 | locally from the community, that is already in       |
| 19 | place, that is already underway whether we ever get  |
| 20 | the PUD.   |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Let me just also                |
| 22 | suggest that a lot of this is a stage 2 matter. If   |
| 23 | you recall in the first stage of a PUD we are        |
| 24 | looking primarily at some of the things that you     |
| 25 | have outlined, that Mr. Thomas Wells outlined in his |
| 26 | letter, size, bulk, certainly those kinds of things  |

| 1  | in kind of broad brush matter. The parameters        |
|----|--|
| 2  | within which the development will take place is what |
| 3  | we focus on most in the first stage. In the second   |
| 4  | stage it is kind of like coloring in a coloring      |
| 5  | book, fine tune it. So some of the things that Mr.   |
| 6  | Anderson mentioned earlier about some of the         |
| 7  | amenities packages and the rest that you ask come at |
| 8  | a second stage where we know a little more about the |
| 9  | details of the PUD and what kinds of opportunities   |
| 10 | it will in fact generate right now we are looking at |
| 11 | the broadest parameters of that development.         |
| 12 | MR. NIXON: I would just like to follow               |
| 13 | up on that question, which is just the one point of  |
| 14 | are what we had the opportunity to do is with        |
| 15 | this lead time is it is not just a matter of getting |
| 16 | a job, it is being ready for that job and keeping    |
| 17 | it. And that is something where the ECC working      |
| 18 | with the community is in an ideal position to really |
| 19 | make this work. MR. SIMON: Jobs are very             |
| 20 | important to all us so that is why I make some       |
| 21 | emphasis on this. And in the submission the          |
| 22 | applicant binds themselves to follow the             |
| 23 | requirements of the first source of law in the       |
| 24 | District of Columbia. I don't know who wants to      |
| 25 | deal with that. But I am wondering whether or not    |
| 26 | the team is aware of the deficiencies in the first   |

| 1  | source of   |
|----|---|
| 2  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Simon that is              |
| 3  | for real a second stage question, it really is.     |
| 4  | MR. SIMON: But jobs are our first stage             |
| 5  | concern.  |
| 6  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: For real we have               |
| 7  | had our own seminars right here in the Zoning       |
| 8  | Commission about that and we have DOES people come  |
| 9  | in and we have had NBOC people come in because we   |
| 10 | were interested in monitoring what happens to PUDs  |
| 11 | and those provisions in PUDs. But that is a fine    |
| 12 | tune detail that I would invite you to ask at the   |
| 13 | second stage. And I know you will be back and I     |
| 14 | know you ask.                                       |
| 15 | MR. SIMON: I appreciate the Commissions             |
| 16 | involvement in those issues.                        |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Waldron do you             |
| 18 | have questions of Mr. Anderson, follow up.          |
| 19 | MR. WALDRON: Peter Waldron. My                      |
| 20 | understanding as I have grown and come to know a    |
| 21 | little more about the ECC business is that it       |
| 22 | significantly alters the application. From my       |
| 23 | understanding, unless I am incorrect, a memo of     |
| 24 | understanding has to be filed, has that been filed? |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: A memorandum of                |
| 26 | understanding for what?                             |

| 1  | MR. WALDRON: On the application itself.              |
|----|--|
| 2  | MR. SIMON: Pursuant to the PUD                       |
| 3  | regulations, I think is what Mr. Waldron is          |
| 4  | referring to.  |
| 5  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: That is a second                |
| 6  | stage matter as well.                                |
| 7  | MS. GIARDANO: Yes and I think that                   |
| 8  | applies, if it is something sort of outside of the   |
| 9  | hearing and we are all right here.                   |
| 10 | MR. SIMON: Thank you.                                |
| 11 | MS. GIARDANO: Madame Chairperson I                   |
| 12 | thought I heard November and                         |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Yes ma'am.                      |
| 14 | November 3 at eight o'clock is what we are           |
| 15 | suggesting.  |
| 16 | MS. GIARDANO: Mr. Haase had submitted a              |
| 17 | letter saying that November is when he expected the  |
| 18 | DOT legislation to pass the Congress and I am just   |
| 19 | asking if there isn't any earlier date even if we    |
| 20 | piggy-back onto another item or                      |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: If you notice we                |
| 22 | are working with a three legged horse here. We have  |
| 23 | one member whose family is facing some serious       |
| 24 | difficulties. We have other members who are not      |
| 25 | going to be available even if we wanted to rope them |
| 26 | back and buckle them down. And we sat up here if     |

| 1  | you noticed trying to figure out for some length of  |
|----|--|
| 2  | time when we could do this. November 3 is the        |
| 3  | earliest date. And that will have to be a eight      |
| 4  | o'clock because one of us has something to do up     |
| 5  | until then.  |
| 6  | MR. FRANKLIN: We have spent many hours               |
| 7  | on this particular project.                          |
| 8  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Many hours.                     |
| 9  | MR. FRANKLIN: I guess my question to                 |
| 10 | you all is when would stage 2 be something you would |
| 11 | be prepared to deliver to us to look at?             |
| 12 | MS. GIARDANO: We want to turn it around              |
| 13 | very rapidly. We are not looking for a two year      |
| 14 | hiatus here, but coming back within a year if this   |
| 15 | DOT tracks the way we are hoping it will.            |
| 16 | MR. FRANKLIN: Let me ask you this,                   |
| 17 | maybe Mr. Haase can answer this question, if the 11b |
| 18 | resolution is what they call it. We really are       |
| 19 | looking at committee action not full House action.   |
| 20 | MR. HAASE: You are looking at both.                  |
| 21 | You are looking Senate approval right now.           |
| 22 | MR. FRANKLIN: When would the DOT be                  |
| 23 | prepared to receive the tour of proposals?           |
| 24 | MR. HAASE: Right away is the way they                |
| 25 | said it to me. It will be a goal of GSA. I am sure   |
| 26 | GSA would get right on it. That speaks to one        |
|    |  |

| 1   | point. The other point that I respectfully ask you   |
|-----|--|
| 2   | to consider is that the government moves at a snails |
| 3   | pace rather than the private sector and when I am    |
| 4   | hearing two years, I would ask you to consider who   |
| 5   | you are dealing with in a situation like this.       |
| 6   | MR. FRANKLIN: I am getting mixed                     |
| 7   | signals. On the one hand we are being told the       |
| 8   | government moves at a snails pace and on the other   |
| 9   | hand we are being told that something is going to    |
| 10  | happen right away.                                   |
| 11  | MR. HAASE: Well, I know. If they go                  |
| 12  | out with their solicitations, say they go out with   |
| 13  | their solicitations November 1, just say they pass   |
| 14  | it next week and they said go. You said your         |
| 15  | hearing is November 3 and you haven't passed the     |
| 16  | PUD, I don't know if they are going to let you bid   |
| 17  | without an approved PUD. I will say they will not.   |
| 18  | That is the critical right there.                    |
| 19  | MR. FRANKLIN: As Ms. Dobbins can                     |
| 20  | explain, but in our normal process if we were to     |
| 21  | conclude the hearing tonight and it was my hope we   |
| 22  | would when would we be taking action under the best  |
| 23  | of circumstances?                                    |
| 24  | MS. DOBBINS: Under the best of                       |
| 25  | circumstances it would probably be next month, if    |
| 2.6 | you kept the record open for a brief period of time. |

| 1  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: And then there is              |
|----|---|
| 2  | NCPC review.  |
| 3  | MR. FRANKLIN: I don't see us concluding             |
| 4  | tonight. I told the chair I would stay until 11:00  |
| 5  | if it looked like there was any hope but I don't    |
| 6  | think there is any hope the way we are proceeding.  |
| 7  | MR. HAASE: That becomes a critical                  |
| 8  | issue is the November 3 against the solicitation or |
| 9  | the request for proposals.                          |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: I don't know what              |
| 11 | we could  |
| 12 | MR. SIMON: I thought Mr. Haase's letter             |
| 13 | indicated November 14 was when he anticipated the   |
| 14 | Senate action.                                      |
| 15 | MR. HAASE: That was a general that                  |
| 16 | is a moving   |
| 17 | MR. FRANKLIN: Congress is going to go               |
| 18 | out of session about mid November.                  |
| 19 | MR. HAASE: That is right, that is a                 |
| 20 | moving target. I talked to them today and they are  |
| 21 | talking about going ahead.                          |
| 22 | MS. GIARDANO: I was just going to ask               |
| 23 | if there is any possibility if this could be tacked |
| 24 | on to the October 20 regular meeting.               |
| 25 | MS. DOBBINS: That's been changed                    |
| 26 | already.  |

| 1   | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: That has been                   |
|-----|--|
| 2   | changed. We are really working here with not a full  |
| 3   | panel and difficulties among its members in terms of |
| 4   | difficulties of things that come up. It would be     |
| 5   | different if we had all members available but we     |
| 6   | just don't.  |
| 7   | MR. FRANKLIN: We have one vacancy and                |
| 8   | one member who can't attend.                         |
| 9   | Who else is going to testify?                        |
| 10  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Is cross                        |
| 11  | examination completed?                               |
| 12  | MR. FRANKLIN: Who else wishes to                     |
| 13  | testify tonight?                                     |
| 14  | MR. SIMON: I guess it is.                            |
| 15  | MR. FRANKLIN: Let me ask if there is                 |
| 16  | MS. SMALLWOOD: Juanita Smallwood,                    |
| 17  | Commission 6B-02.                                    |
| 18  | MR. FRANKLIN: And who else?                          |
| 19  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: The problem is it               |
| 20  | comes out of order. We haven't heard from OP. A      |
| 21  | good portion of our procedure is arranged as it is   |
| 22  | so that the citizenry and others can be as well      |
| 23  | informed as possible before they come up to testify. |
| 24  | So we have our applicant's layout in excruciating    |
| 25  | detail what is they want to do. We have the          |
| 2.6 | official response from the Office of Planning. We    |

| 1  | have cross examination of all that. And then we      |
|----|--|
| 2  | have persons and parties in support and opposition   |
| 3  | in part for educational purposes as well as anything |
| 4  | else. So when we start taking people out of line     |
| 5  | the process goes haywire.                            |
| 6  | MR. FRANKLIN: I withdraw the                         |
| 7  | suggestion.  |
| 8  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: I didn't mean to                |
| 9  | sound it is just the way it happens. Were there      |
| 10 | any other people you wanted to question so we don't  |
| 11 | have revisit that?                                   |
| 12 | MR. FRANKLIN: And refine yourself to                 |
| 13 | the part 1 submission concerns which were addressed  |
| 14 | in your letter of March.                             |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Mr. Wells' letter.              |
| 16 | MR. FRANKLIN: But a lot of your                      |
| 17 | questions were really addressed to part 2            |
| 18 | considerations and that's what was concerning me     |
| 19 | before. So if you could keep them in                 |
| 20 | MR. SIMON: We won't ask any more                     |
| 21 | questions this evening. Perhaps if you give us a     |
| 22 | little leeway during our presentation if we veer     |
| 23 | someplace or another but we are prepared to          |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Let me just say                 |
| 25 | that frequently it is more efficient to state        |
| 26 | clearly what it is that you see or understand or     |

| 1  | disagree with then it is to try to elicit it through |
|----|--|
| 2  | cross examination and in effect have the applicant   |
| 3  | make your case or make you point. It is a little     |
| 4  | more tortuous that way.                              |
| 5  | MR. SIMON: Certainly.                                |
| 6  | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: Although you do                 |
| 7  | have the grist for the mill in their presentation,   |
| 8  | in their reports, and in their testimony against     |
| 9  | which you can ask questions. So if you have no       |
| 10 | further questions.                                   |
| 11 | MR. SIMON: No further questions.                     |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: All right.                      |
| 13 | MR. WESTBROOK: I want to go home.                    |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: I know, you are                 |
| 15 | not by yourself. We used to do this years ago until  |
| 16 | well after 11:00, 11:30, remember those days?        |
| 17 | MR. WESTBROOK: I remember them.                      |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: We are not                      |
| 19 | chickens anymore.                                    |
| 20 | Okay, several things were asked to come              |
| 21 | into the record. One is Mr. Dobbins resume. The      |
| 22 | other is a diagram showing the property line, the    |
| 23 | bulkhead, the bulkhead line, and some resolution to  |
| 24 | the question of who owns the property between the    |
| 25 | bulkhead line and the property line. The third       |
| 26 | thing that I have is any communication that you have |

| 1  | received, I am talking now to the applicant, from    |
|----|--|
| 2  | the Army Corps of Engineers. And we were asked to    |
| 3  | leave the record open to receive the Committee of    |
| 4  | 100's testimony but is still open so they should be  |
| 5  | able to get that in. Was there anything that I may   |
| 6  | have overlooked that was supposed to come into the   |
| 7  | record that we would normally be saying if I were to |
| 8  | wrap this up, pleas have it in by a time certain?    |
| 9  | MS. DOBBINS: Well I still think that                 |
| 10 | the information come in prior to the hearing date so |
| 11 | that persons can come in and review the record in    |
| 12 | advance.   |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: As well any                     |
| 14 | material that was passed out, please make sure that  |
| 15 | 6B and 2D get copies.                                |
| 16 | MS. DOBBINS: Madame Chair I would like               |
| 17 | to request that those persons who spoke into the     |
| 18 | microphone at all tonight and did not submit witness |
| 19 | cards, please fill out two tonight and give them to  |
| 20 | the court reporter.                                  |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON BENNETT: All right now we                |
| 22 | will reconvene on Monday, November 3 at 8:00 p.m. I  |
| 23 | am sorry for whatever inconvenience this has caused  |
| 24 | and we hope to see you then. Thank you.              |
| 25 | (Whereupon, the proceedings in the                   |
| 26 | above-entitled matter were adjourned at 10:46 p.m.,  |

| 1  | to | reconvene | at | 8:00 | p.m., | November | 3, | 1997. |
|----|----|-----------|----|------|-------|----------|----|-------|
| 2  |    |           |    |      |       |          |    |       |
| 3  |    |           |    |      |       |          |    |       |
| 4  |    |           |    |      |       |          |    |       |
| 5  |    |           |    |      |       |          |    |       |
| 6  |    |           |    |      |       |          |    |       |
| 7  |    |           |    |      |       |          |    |       |
| 8  |    |           |    |      |       |          |    |       |
| 9  |    |           |    |      |       |          |    |       |
| 10 |    |           |    |      |       |          |    |       |
| 11 |    |           |    |      |       |          |    |       |
| 12 |    |           |    |      |       |          |    |       |
| 13 |    |           |    |      |       |          |    |       |
| 14 |    |           |    |      |       |          |    |       |
|    |    |           |    |      |       |          |    |       |

15